P957
S471

ASSOCIATED MENNONITE BIBLICAL SEMINARIES
GOSHEN
LIBRARY

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

Revolution and Religion	Samuel H. Miller
The New Man in the New Age	Jas. I. McCord
Medieval Studies in A Program of Reformed Theology	Georges A. Barrois
The Ministry of A Prison Chaplain	E. Frederick Proelss
The Christian Education of Conscience	C. Ellis Nelson
Sermons:	
Prepared to Be	James G. Emerson
The Love of God	John H. Marks
Review-Article: The New English Bible	Bruce M. Metzger

VOLUME LV, NUMBER 1
SEPTEMBER 1961

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Jas. I. McCord
President

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Peter K. Emmons, President — John M. Templeton, Vice-President
Frederick E. Christian, Secretary — George W. Loos, Jr., Treasurer
The Hanover Bank, New York, N.Y., Assistant Treasurer

Arthur M. Adams
Roland W. Anderson
Clem E. Bininger
Eugene Carson Blake
Charles Edward Brubaker
John G. Buchanan
Allan M. Frew
John T. Galloway
E. Harris Harbison
Ralph Cooper Hutchison
Weir C. Ketler
Bryant M. Kirkland
Harry G. Kuch
Raymond I. Lindquist
John S. Linen
Edmund P. Lorenz
James K. Louden
Thomas M. MacMillan
Joseph E. McCabe
John W. Meister
W. Beverly Murphy
Mrs. John J. Newberry
William H. Scheide
H. D. Moore Sherrerd
W. Sherman Skinner
George E. Sweazey
Mrs. Paul Switz
Samuel G. Warr
David B. Watermulder

TRUSTEES EMERITI

Richard J. Dearborn
Benjamin F. Farber
Henry Hird
Wm. Hallock Johnson
Albert J. McCartney
Mrs. Charles O. Miller

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

DONALD MACLEOD, *Editor* — EDWARD J. JURJI, *Book Review Editor*

The BULLETIN is published quarterly by the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey. Numbers 1, 2, and 3 of each volume are mailed free of charge to all alumni and on an exchange basis with various institutions. Number 4 in the series is the annual academic catalogue of the Seminary and may be obtained by request to the Office of the Registrar.

Entered as second class matter May 1, 1907, *at the post office at Princeton, N.J., under the Act of Congress of July* 16, 1894.

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. LV SEPTEMBER, 1961 Number 1

Donald Macleod, Editor Edward J. Jurji, Book Review Editor

REVOLUTION AND RELIGION *Samuel H. Miller* 4

PRESIDENT'S FAREWELL REMARKS TO GRADUATING CLASS 9

THE NEW MAN IN THE NEW AGE *Jas. I. McCord* 11

MEDIEVAL STUDIES IN A PROGRAM OF REFORMED THEOLOGY *Georges A. Barrois* 17

THE MINISTRY OF A PRISON CHAPLAIN *E. Frederick Proelss* 25

THE CHRISTIAN EDUCATION OF CONSCIENCE *C. Ellis Nelson* 37

SERMONS:

PREPARED TO BE *James G. Emerson* 48

THE LOVE OF GOD *John H. Marks* 51

REVIEW—ARTICLE: THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE *Bruce M. Metzger* 56

BOOK REVIEWS:

The Presbyterian Way of Life, by J. A. Mackay *Lewis S. Mudge* 64

American Christianity: an Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents, Vol. I, by H. Shelton Smith, L. A. Loetscher, and Robert T. Handy *Wallace N. Jamison* 65

Dogmatics, by Hermann Diem *Otto A. Piper* 66

The Theology of the Gospel According to Thomas, by B. Gärtner 67

Jesus of Nazareth, by Günther Bornkamm 68

Luther's Works: Vol. 35, Word and Sacrament I, ed. by H. T. Lehmann and E. T. Bachmann 68

Luther's Works: Vol. 2, Lectures on Genesis, Chaps. 6-14, by H. T. Lehmann and J. Pelikan 69

God's Word into English, by Dewey M. Beegle *James P. Martin* 69

Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study, by F. W. Danker 70

Prophet, Speak Now, by Robert B. McNeill *Philip C. Hammond* 71

God and History in the Old Testament, by Harvey H. Guthrie 71

The Coming Reformation, by Geddes MacGregor *Norman V. Hope* 72

An Era in Anglican Theology, by Arthur M. Ramsey 73

The Spirit of Protestantism, by Robert McA. Brown 73

The Making of a Minister, ed. by J. Clyde Henry 75

The New-Time Religion, by Claire Cox 75

Christianity in a Revolutionary Age, Vol. III, by K. S. Latourette — *John E. Smylie* — 76
Religious Affections, by J. Edwards, ed. by John E. Smith — *James H. Smylie* — 78
The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards, by D. J. Elwood — 78
Land of Eldorado, by Sante Uberto Barbieri — *J. Christy Wilson* — 80
Assignment Overseas, by John Rosengrant, *et al* — 81
Ethics and the Gospel, by T. W. Manson — *Guy H. Ranson* — 81
Key Next Door, by Leslie D. Weatherhead — *Donald Macleod* — 82
Point of Glad Return, by Lance Webb — 83
The Lord's Supper, by Theodore G. Tappert — 83

FACULTY PUBLICATIONS, 1960 — 84

IN THIS ISSUE

WITH the publication of the Seminary's latest periodical, *The Alumni News,* an interesting and attractive paper which each alumnus has now received, information and details about Commencement, faculty changes, alumni meetings, and campus events will no longer appear in *The Bulletin* but will be reported under this new and more dramatic format. *The Bulletin,* however, will continue to publish addresses, lectures, and scholarly papers given in connection with the general cultural and devotional program of the academic year.

The Commencement address, "Revolution and Religion," by Dr. Samuel H. Miller, Dean of Harvard Divinity School, which evoked much comment here and across the nation, is printed for the wider reading of many interested inquirers.

"The New Man in the New Age" was an able and engaging address delivered by President McCord at the opening of the Summer Institute of Theology. Also we are pleased to be able to publish "The Lord's Song in a Strange Land," a brief charge by Dr. McCord to the Graduating Class on Commencement Day, June 5, 1961.

Other articles of interest and of scholarly calibre are: "Medieval Studies in a Program of Reformed Theology," an address delivered by Dr. Georges A. Barrois on the occasion of his installation as Professor of the History and Theology of the Medieval Church; "The Ministry of a Prison Chaplain," an unusual and highly original presentation given at the annual banquet of the Senior Class by the Reverend E. Frederick Proelss, Ju.D., Senior and Resident Chaplain at New York City Correctional Institution for Men, Riker's Island, N.Y.; and "The Christian Education of Conscience," given by Dr. C. Ellis Nelson of Union Theological Seminary, New York, under the Christian Education Lectureship at Princeton in January, 1961.

Two sermons by alumni are featured in this issue: "Prepared to Be," delivered in Miller Chapel at the Sunday morning service of the Annual Vocations Conference, by the Reverend James G. Emerson, Ph.D., minister of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Bloomfield, N.J.; and "The Love of God," given in the University Chapel, December 25, 1960, by the Reverend John H. Marks, Th.D. of the Department of Oriental Studies.

Along with the regular book reviews is a very fair and penetrating review-article on *The New English Bible*, written by Professor Bruce M. Metzger of the Department of Biblical Studies.

A careful compilation of the lists of publications by the Faculty during 1960 has been done by the Reverend Dale E. Bussis of the Department of Speech.

D. M.

REVOLUTION AND RELIGION

SAMUEL H. MILLER

ONE ought to apologize for the screaming violence of such a title, but one cannot apologize for the condition of the world which necessitates it in all honesty. Religion, if it is to deal with this present world, will have to deal with a world in full-scale radical revolution. We cannot cope with it by treating it as though it were the same world in which Christianity was presupposed. The situation has deteriorated. When Gouverneur Morris in 1789 wrote back to Washington about Louis XVI, he said of him, "He is a good man. In ordinary times he would have made a good King. But he has inherited a revolution." Religion as it stands might have handled the world fairly well, but for the fact that the world has been turned upside down, the bases of thought and action have shifted and most institutions have suffered a sea-change of radical dimensions.

The arts have erupted with extraordinary vitality in a score of styles and schools, radically free from traditional dependence on objective reality, and bewildering our time with their problematic and vigorous statements. Philosophy, long the effort of reason to abstract a coherent scheme of things from the world and offer men a moral purpose has retreated from its classic scope to satisfy itself in cautious analysis of syntactical order and logic. Politics, the art of government, has ramified in a thousand directions until the state has become incredibly huge and massive in its care and control of its citizenry. If religion is to deal effectively, or one might say to deal at all with such a world, it must itself undergo a radical revolution. The situation is far advanced; indeed, the critical point of no return may have been passed.

Answers cribbed from the back of the book, as Kierkegaard said, will not suffice to meet the problems now raised by more complicated factors of contemporary culture. The sacred rigidity of earlier formulae is instructive but not adequate. The ancient dogmas no longer dominate the imagination; the modern divisions no longer capture men's loyalties. The shape of life has changed; the patterns of truth are different; the questions have new terms; doubts have deeper dimensions; the hunger of the heart and mind has been enlarged; the risks have greater costs. We need the warning of Herman Melville: "Woe to him who seeks to pour oil upon the waters when God has brewed them into a gale. . . ."

To be sure, in every age multitudes will find it possible to live within the shadow of the battlefield without hearing the tumult and the cries. They are sheltered by the thick walls of custom, the heavy momentum of memory and tradition, and the impervious stubbornness to admit change. People will live in the "world" of the 19th century long after it has disappeared except in their habitual prejudices and attitudes.

This world is breaking into three new dimensions which demand the attention of religion if faith is not to be left behind in the great push forward. There is, first of all, the Freudian probe

which has illuminated man's inner life and revealed not only the great depths of the psyche but its devious mechanisms and deceptive rationalizations. An abyss within man, full of new embarrassments and a new terror, has been unveiled. What we believe about ourselves, our relationships to God, our moral relationships, and the nature of our atonement with God as well as the nature of Christ as the God-man cannot rest as if Freud had not opened this new dimension of the psyche.

The second breakthrough is the space probe. Here man is not only thinking about the stars; he is about to colonize them, using a new dimension of power that man has never known before. Will that probe carry the infection of our immemorial hate and violence out into interstellar space? Will it be possible any longer to derive any sense of peace from contemplating the sun and the stars, the "work of God's fingers"? How deep a thrust will this put upon *hubris* and pride? How easily will we be deceived into thinking that such achievements in space will resolve our troubled spirits? Here again faith must deal with a new dimension of power and its demonic use in destructive ways. Can we manage to lift the level of our moral courage to deal constructively with such skill and enormous energy?

The third probe of threatening dimensions is the technological organization of the world which sustains a world-wide society long before we have developed the social imagination and restraint to stabilize and habituate the structures of peace and mutual respect. We have been catapulted with astonishing abruptness into one world, where the slightest event anywhere may have catastrophic significance everywhere, and where economically and technically we must live together although as races and religions we simply do not know the first ABCs of understanding each other. Faith again must find a way to stretch our hearts, widen our imagination, broaden our hospitality, and deepen our concern.

It is in these vast new dimensions of the modern world that religion must speak the word that illuminates the way, strengthens the heart beyond custom and prejudice, and courageously wrestles with the large perspectives still unredeemed in personality, in power and in society. If it cannot do this, it can do nothing. It should then in decency get out of the way so that men will not be tripped up by its frumpery or fooled by its solemnity. There is serious work to be done, lest the world descend into darkness deeper than we have ever known before.

It is not enough to do everything we have always done. The Church cannot amuse itself with the posture of past prestige or present popularity; it has inherited a revolution. It will be judged by the measure of its action in dealing with the radical changes in our world, not by its nostalgic reverence or its sterile respectability.

I should like to illustrate our problem by pointing out some areas where our perceptiveness is strained to the utmost lest we fall into the easy acceptance of an already empty shell of sacred traditions or forms.

In the first place, confusion arises from over-facile assumptions concerning our concept of God. The experience of modern man is no longer greatly illumined or clarified by the traditional images or representations of God. The matter is epitomized in Al-

bert Camus's response when he was asked if he believed in God. He said he did not, but that he was "not an atheist. [Atheism] was far too easy an answer." Perhaps more clarifying is Gabriel Marcel's utterance, "When we *speak* of God, it is not God we speak of." It is too easy to jump to the conclusion that the man who has outgrown our notion of God is simply an atheist. We may fall into the fallacy of Job's comforters whose small thoughts, while quite orthodox, nevertheless did no justice to God but betrayed the larger dimensions of His mystery in order to reduce Him to their own comfortable prejudices. In our day, men are struggling to bring their minds and hearts to embrace a larger magnitude of reality than men have ever known before. Such a venture may carry us back to the Psalms and the parables, but if it does, it undoubtedly will make short shrift of the infantile motions which have so often masqueraded under the shadows of those profound simplicities.

This whole confusion is derived from the idolatrizing tendency of language. We give a name to the divine, and then the name obscures the reality, becomes a substitute for it, and makes it impossible to reach through it to the original event or reality out of which the name was derived. Whitehead succinctly describes the situation when he says that "the keynote of idolatry is contentment with the prevalent gods." We might easily paraphrase this by saying that idolatry is contentment with a notion of God which no longer articulates the numinous mystery which is the source of life's sanctity or manifests the power which transforms man and fulfills the world.

The witnesses to this revolt against the Christian idolatry are many. Nor are they superficially arrogant or sophomoric showmen. They are, in any reasonable evaluation, religious. I am thinking of Simone Weil, Albert Camus, Franz Kafka. The fact is, as Jean Lacroix has said, "When we are talking about atheism, we are not always talking about the rejection of God."

Indeed, the contemporary rise of a passionately religious atheism is related to several very positive factors in the present epoch, among which is the question of man's freedom. Rightly or wrongly—Sartre has pushed the "old" God out in order to make room for man to accept this freedom seriously, and with full responsibility. Camus has pushed the old God out in order to lay a larger claim for a profounder compassion, a compassion which he feels has dried up in the Western church. These men are asking for greater honesty about the human condition, demanding severer dimensions of responsibility, and opening both freedom and compassion to new depths.

What we surely must face here is the entrance upon a new dimension of thought about the nature of God. If so-called religious atheism marks the honest recognition of insufficient representations in the light of new dimensions of reality, then such an atheism is not by itself an irreligious stance. It is the movement of the spirit by which religion itself may be saved from itself. Cries of atheism confronted Jesus, Paul, and Luther. Nothing could be more tragic than to find ourselves hugging our own sanctified, pseudo-Christian idol, blind and hostile to the living revelation of God's mystery in our own time.

We encounter difficulty again when

we attempt to distinguish between nature and grace. As long as God's acts were conceived as interruptions of natural law—thrusts from outer space or inner mystery into man's life—the imagery could be kept intact and God's activities validated in miracle and conversion. But, as Bonhoeffer has so powerfully put it, the world has come of age. Its credulity and superstition, to a large extent, are outgrown. The naïve has no place in our open-eyed sophisticated maturity. We must find out now what the religious dimension and meaning of nature is in its own right. We have a doctrine of redemption in Protestantism but no doctrine of nature. How is law related to grace, or revelation to reason, or faith to knowledge? We stand in profound need of an interpretation of transcendence which will not do violence to our empirical experience.

Finally, we are baffled when we confront "Jesus Christ." You will forgive me for putting quotation marks around that title. It is almost as impossible for us now to get around the full figure of Christ as it is to get around the name of God, and to see it freshly, that is, meaningfully, and for the sake of revelation rather than the corroboration of our inherited or accumulated notions. Our relationship to the Christ has been obscured. We tend to say too much or too little. But surely in Christ, the redemptive man (once again to use a simpler term), we can recognize our destiny as human beings. He reflects *our* possibility as redeeming persons. The *redemptive man* is our destiny, the new Being, the goal of the gospel, the product of the New Testament, the disciple of the Lord, the man in the Church, the servant in the Kingdom, the hope of the world.

The redemptive man is the redeeming man. He is the man in whose being life is transformed, made meaningful. He is the man whose consciousness is stretched by all the diverse and contradictory conditions of our time, yet whose mind and heart wrestle to pull them together meaningfully. In his imagination the split and schizophrenic forces of art and religion and science and politics are held together and fused. He takes the uneasiness, the embarrassment, the divisiveness, the shame, the guilt, the fear and dread, the very sins of the world into his own heart, to make them one in a purpose and unity known best by God.

Only one kind of religion counts today, and that is the kind which is radical enough to engage in this world's basic troubles. If it cannot do that, then it can do nothing which merits our concern or the world's respect. Religion which is interested only in itself, in its prestige and success, in its institutions and ecclesiastical niceties, is worse than vanity; it is essentially incestuous. Religion reveals itself in struggling to reveal the meaning of the world.

In the records of the trial of Joan of Arc there is a moving passage in which she addresses her judges. In all boldness she answered the Bishop questioning her. "You say that you are my judge. Take good care of what you do, for in truth I am sent by God, and you are putting yourself in great danger." It does not require much manipulation to turn this incident to our situation. If we think ourselves sitting in judgment on the world—a very favorite posture of the church and clergy, by the way—we had better take warning. The world may be sent by God, and unless we deal

with it, seriously and humbly, we may indeed be in great danger.

But honest men do not want easy answers, trumped up panaceas, peace of mind at any price. They have a world on their hands, burgeoning with unprecedented power, frightened by its own momentum, haunted by something it lost a long time ago—

It needs help, but not condescension. It needs men bold, but modest, who will put a shoulder under the darkness of a world where God is lost, under lives where the pain of wanting to believe is enough to break your heart; under the vast compassion of the lost, whose last hope and trust is to be true to their fellow men in an agony whose meaning they cannot divine. It has its hunger, terrible and ineluctable; it will not be satisfied with "cheap grace" or specious sentiments or pious respectability. It has doubts, shame, pride, embarrassment, and dread, and it finds it hard to be honest, because we ourselves are not often honest.

The world is sent by God, and we—ministers of His grace—are in great danger.

"Christian commitment is much more than admiration for Jesus Christ. It goes far beyond having orthodox ideas about him. It is possible to vociferate the great doctrines about Christ without having any personal relationship to Christ. Committed Christians are loyal to the Church. They attend its services; they support its causes; they live in accordance with its requirements. But they do not confuse formal Church membership with commitment to Jesus Christ. They belong to him as their gracious Redeemer and sovereign Lord to whom they owe everything and to whom they give everything. Life has become for them no mere pursuit of happiness, no anxious effort to achieve success, no eager quest for inward peace. They do not use their religion to give them social status. They do not confuse their religion with contributing to good causes. They do not equate their freedom with patriotism. Belonging to Christ, they want to be Christlike, in the vocation which they follow and in every sphere in which they move. They are eager to serve Christ's cause in the world as members of the community of Christ, which is the Church. They will seek light upon their path of duty by having recourse to Bible study and prayer, to the counsel of fellow Christians, and to the wisdom which is enshrined in the Church's heritage of faith.

This they will do in humble dependence upon the Holy Spirit, with an inner glow of enthusiasm, and with an outward demeanor of steady, unashamed, disciplined dedication to Christ and his cause."

—John A. Mackay, in *The Presbyterian Way of Life*, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1960, pp. 87, 88.

THE LORD'S SONG IN A STRANGE LAND

FAREWELL REMARKS TO THE 1961 GRADUATING CLASS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SEMINARY

Let me take as a text for my farewell remarks the words of the Psalmist: "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?"

This plaintive query stemmed from the memory of an exile from Jerusalem who had languished long and brooding years in Babylonian captivity. Etched in his memory were the days when "by the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof." The Psalmist remained a captive, and he never forgot it. They could transport him in body to a foreign capital, but his spirit remained in Zion. Babylon was no responsibility of his. It was the land of heathen, outside the pale of God's interest and activity, a strange land! They could keep him there, but he would remain an alien. He could never discern any inkling of God's purpose in what was going on in the history round about him.

Let me venture the suggestion that what is reflected in the experience of the unknown author of this Psalm may well be the greatest temptation that will come to you in your ministry. Dr. Charles West has written in his introduction to *A Christian in East Germany* that "the danger of inner emigration . . . is the greatest single danger which confronts the Church. It amounts to an inner withdrawal from all responsible life." Of course, he is writing against the background of those who live in the German Democratic Republic and who attempt to live with their imagination and hopes in another zone rather than to accept where they have been sent as the ordering of God himself. And this is the point of Johannes Hamel, the author, in his chapter on "God's Beloved East Zone." All of us must learn that every zone of life and action is beloved by God.

But let me be specific about ourselves, for we are tempted to our own forms of inner emigration. Many are striving to emigrate from the new age that is dawning. A few years ago we were accustomed to speak of "a time between the times," an historical parenthesis sandwiched between an old age which was expiring and a new age not yet born. Now the new age has come, ushering in an era of universal history and a chain of revolutions. Old structures are dissolving and old orders are crumbling. The emergence of universal history has challenged our parochialism and provincialism, and the revolutions challenge our privileges and our position. In the face of all this we are tempted to withdraw, to emigrate inwardly, to seek security in another age, as if God and none other had not brought in this age as a gift to his people.

Again, in our land we are tempted to inner emigration from the urban culture that has developed in a technological age. Even those of you who were born in cities are chock full of images of rural America, and the Church appears spiritually homeless in the new

culture that is developing. We seek to re-establish old rural patterns in suburbia, and only rarely does one meet the person who looks forward joyfully and with hope to the new life developing in the city. We have not yet begun to seek out new forms of ministry and witness and to adapt our practices and institutions to these new conditions. In our spirits we emigrate to the countryside, where we hang our harps on a willow and cry out, "How can we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?"

Our inner emigration may even be extended to the Church itself. The Church has grown in size and complexity, has become more highly organized, and requires more and more attention to her institutional life, all the while we have been singing about "the church in the valley by the wildwood." Unable to match spirit and place, we are tempted to lose confidence in the Church's mission and openly to wonder it it should not disengage from this age, withdraw from its complex structures, and assume a ghetto existence in another place and another century. How else can you account for the negativism about the Church in our time and the use of such phrases as "post-Christian" and "post-Protestant" in so much of our current literature?

When, contrary to all that both you and I have been taught in homiletics, I began to look about for a text in the Bible that would reflect this experience, I found the task exceedingly difficult. For the attitude of inner emigration is completely alien to the Bible's way of looking at the world. All the world and all its structures belong to Christ, and all history is the arena of God's activity. A contemporary of the Psalmist, the unknown author whom we call Deutero-Isaiah, shared the experience of exile and knew Israel's darkest hour. But it was here, in this strange land and in this black hour, that he saw a vision of a new Jerusalem, redeemed and restored, fit now to be the instrument of God's redeeming purpose among all men.

Let this, then, be your experience wherever you are called, for there is no land or condition alien to the purpose of God or outside the breadth of his love. This is no cheap world affirmation. Rather it is a summons to courage and to action. You will be able to meet whatever new conditions arise in the confidence that each may be a "Kairos" that will be filled up with the redeeming and transforming power of Christ. Go forth from these halls and sing the Lord's song in every land, in faithfulness to him who is the Lord of life and of death.

THE NEW MAN IN THE NEW AGE

Jas. I. McCord

TONIGHT marks the twentieth anniversary of the Institute of Theology. From its beginning two decades ago the Institute has been conceived as something other than a summer conference, for, as its name implies, its purpose is to pursue a theological theme through Biblical studies, courses and laboratory work, and convocation hours and to offer ministers and laymen the possibility of looking carefully at some aspect of the life of man in the light of God. May this fortnight in Princeton be for you a period of renewal as you lay aside your heavy parish responsibilities and explore this year's theme, "The New Man in the New Age."

Both of these phrases, "new man" and "new age," are Biblical. The writings of Paul abound in references to the "new man." He assures his Corinthian readers that "if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creature." To the Galatians he writes: "For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation," and in the Ephesian letter it is clear that the "new man" has come in Jesus Christ and that "complete manhood" is "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." As Dr. J. M. Shaw has put it, the New Testament does not speak of making man better but of making him new.

The "new age" figures no less prominently in Scripture. To the Seer in the Apocalypse it revealed the same "new heavens and new earth" that had inspired Deutero-Isaiah, for He who sat upon the throne had spoken: "Behold, I make all things new." Please note that it is not merely a new heaven; God's purpose also involves a new earth, a new creation redeemed and restored, fit now to be the arena of His glory.

We grew accustomed to the word "new" during the long years of World War II. It caught up the expectations of men everywhere. All agreed that an old epoch had passed and that any attempt to return to pre-war "normalcy" would be as absurd as it would be futile. For "normalcy" has meaning only within a given context, and we were all convinced that the context of the old era had already passed away. The war and the years immediately thereafter represented a historical pause, "a time between the times," a moment's hesitation before the shape of things to come could be delineated.

Now, however, the historical parenthesis has ended and the characteristics of the new age have begun to emerge. The first is the dawn of universal history. Here is something absolutely unique to our age. It was dramatized less than a year ago on the banks of the East River in New York. Here were gathered leaders from nearly all the nations of the world at a meeting of the United Nations, some coming from nations accustomed to power and others from nations whose names we find difficult to remember and from capitals that we have not yet learned. They participated, the old and the young, in a

single forum and were part of a single history.

Some represented peoples who had only recently been released from what Professor H. Berkhof has called "the sacred bondage of nature." The radiations of Western culture had accomplished this. A little more than a generation ago they were a people without history. Many possessed no records; their life followed the cycles of nature. One is astonished while reading Alan Moorehead's *The White Nile*, an account of the search for the source of Egypt's lifegiving stream, that this situation persisted well into the late nineteenth century and that within the life span of a distinguished contemporary, Sir Winston Churchill, these peoples could be catapulted from the bondage of nature into the stream of universal history. Formerly nature had set a ceiling on their horizon. Even their gods were little more than personifications of nature's forces. But all this is past, and now their children and grandchildren have assumed their places in the councils of the nations.

Moreover, the dawn of universal history has ended the separate histories of nations. Is not this the real meaning of colonialism, where one nation is free to act unilaterally with other nations? Each colonial power was thus able to write its own separate history, to extend its influence and to impose its order. But this is no longer possible. It would be simple if, for example, the United States could settle the Cuban problem according to the colonial pattern that had obtained for centuries. Belgium, too, would have had less difficulty in the Congo if hers were still a separate history. But a small island only ninety miles off the coast of the mainland of the United States, just as a huge empire in tropical Africa, is projected now into the context of world history, must be understood against the background of all the tensions that exist between East and West, and can be dealt with only in the light of a global conflict. The same is true of the Congo. Belgium belatedly realized that a new climate had arisen and that new structures must be found if she was to retain her hegemony over a land that was once the private domain of her monarch. She tried frantically to move out from under the old pattern in order to re-enter under a new, only to discover that her problem could no longer be solved unilaterally. It had been caught up in a global context. And Portugal will discover this soon, and her intrasigence in resisting this universalizing process can only result in more bitterness and bloodshed.

We have spoken of a universal context of existence for all peoples of the world and of its implications for those who have been in bondage to nature and to colonial powers. But there are implications that have relevance to our condition. It represents a challenge to many of the institutions that we have taken for granted, institutions that grew up in another age and under more favorable conditions. We no longer live in a period of expansion in which there is more and more space to be entered into and possessed. We are being forced to learn that our political, social, and economic forms cannot be preserved in isolation from the other nations of the world.

There are also ideological and ideational implications here for us. Is it possible to remain parochial in our education and understanding, mere West-

erners without any knowledge of the vast majority of mankind? Can we tolerate any longer an education or a world-view that is so narrow and limited that our citizens cannot see beyond the bounds of a single culture? All of us, of course, are citizens of the West, educated in the tradition of Jerusalem, Athens, and Rome. We trace the legacy of this culture as it moves westward and finally crosses the North Atlantic to these shores. Our education is the means whereby we appropriate this culture and possess our citizenship in it. But today we must possess something vastly greater. For our separate history has been caught up into another history, one that is universal in its scope, and we can no longer be blind to the other strains that have merged into this single stream.

All of this raises afresh for the Christian the question of the uniqueness of his faith. Inevitably the dawn of universal history will be a stimulus to syncretism. Traditionally its home has been the East, and one is not surprised to find today one of its most eloquent spokesmen in India's Radhakrishnan. But syncretism is also emerging in the West. Our most widely read historian, Arnold Toynbee, is an apostle of a syncretism of Christianity and Mahayanian Buddhism. To be sure, the syncretist may be rightly accused of intellectual laziness and of thinking without discrimination. Nonetheless his presence today is an indication of the necessity of a Christian apologetic that will take seriously the new conditions that have emerged and the new context out of which the syncretistic question is asked in our time.

The second characteristic of the new age is the dawn of the metropolis and of a new way of life. This has paralleled the Scientific Revolution, another novelty of our century. C. P. Snow, in his *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution,* makes a strong case for a distinction between the Industrial Revolution, which may be dated from the middle of the eighteenth century, and the Scientific Revolution, which belongs to the twentieth. The latter, he claims, will transform the world much more radically than its predecessor and its speed will be sharply accelerated over that of the former. Those who are involved in urban studies are already pointing to the changes that have come and will come. Kevin Lynch and Lloyd Rodwin have written of a world of cities. In a period of fifty years they predict that "the majority of the world's population will be accommodated in vast metropolitan complexes, each on a scale of twenty million people or more." This is the metropolis, a phenomenon no more than a century old and qualitatively different from the city that preceded it. And it is a phenomenon that is global. It will characterize Johannesburg as well as New York, São Paulo as well as London, and it implies a way of life that will be vastly different in its organization and complexity from anything that man has known.

The third characteristic of the new age is loss of confidence in the Church, both on the part of those outside the fellowship and on the part of many within. Certainly the Christian Church can no longer assume the privileged position and acceptance she has known heretofore. Even in the West the state has become increasingly alienated and inimical to the Church. Thus many critics have been writing about a post-

Constantinian era into which we have entered. What they mean is that the official relation between Church and empire established in the fourth century during the reign of the Emperor Constantine has been dissolved. Its dissolution began centuries ago, perhaps before the Reformation, but the reformers took no cognizance of it. They took for granted a "Corpus Christianum," a Christian civilization in which the Church was to perform her spiritual role, while the state continued to operate on the basis of Christian presuppositions. But sensitive spirits today realize the futility of this assumption. Franklin Littell tells us in *The German Phoenix* of how this realization came to post-war Germany and of the steps that have been taken to educate and deepen a remnant in a culture that can no longer be called Christian. A German professor told me last summer that the statement he hears most often from university students is "God is dead for me." Nietzsche's prophecy has come true in our time! Neville Shute's *On the Beach* is a commentary on this. Here is life without eschatology, the slow petering out of things as the mushroom cloud driven by the wind descends on the last inhabitants of the globe. The banner proclaims "There is still time, brother," but the suicide pill is the symbol of man's hopeless plight.

If the Church has lost her ability to capture the imagination and inspire the culture around her, she has also lost her own self-confidence and has begun to wonder openly about her role. She has become introverted, turned in on herself, and has broken off contact with the world that she no longer knows. She was unable to capitalize on the revival of interest in religion after the war, is depressed about her failure in mission, and contents herself with endless surveys and meetings in an effort to knock something together that might get her off center.

Against the background of the new age is emerging a new man who will people it. Here is the most hopeful sign of our time. This new man's emergence is attested in many areas. The modern artist, for example, speaks of a revolution that has occurred in his conception of man. No longer is his canvas cluttered with the daubs of paint one finds in the productions of Jackson Pollock. No longer is man in bits and in pieces as in Pablo Picasso's "Guernica." Rather, there seems to be emerging on the canvas a new image, something with the face of a man and with a form that is human. The behavioral scientists bear witness to the same revolution in their thought. The environmentalists in the past had reduced man to a puppet and had enslaved him to the forces around him. But behavioral scientists today speak of responsibility and have rediscovered the dignity and essential humanity of man. And is this not what one finds wherever he travels over the globe? There is emerging a new race of men in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that is intent on a reordering of mankind and that is claiming its own responsible humanity. I remember last summer talking with a group of students from Senegal and being impressed with their maturity, with their high hopes and clear goals for the future of their nation, and with their feeling of solidarity with all men emerging into freedom.

The new man who is emerging is not neurotic and sick. The neurotic is the old man, still enmeshed in an age that

has dissolved. This has become our predicament. Is it possible that modern Protestantism is pampering the one segment of society that is unable to accept what is happening on a global scale? Is it possible that we are the neurotic segment of the world's population, the segment that is unwilling to move into the future with courage and with faith? Is it possible that we have reduced the Christian Gospel to a form of medication for a people that is sick? Have we lost the power to create the new through expending our efforts to medicate the old? Have we substituted the courage to be for the courage to become the new man in Christ?

Our greatest challenge is not that of bringing an old age to a discreet and comfortable end but of meeting the new man in the new age with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Ours must be the age of apologetic theology and preaching. We must move out of our ecclesiastical ghettos and engage those to whom the future belongs. The Biblical and theological renewal of the Church has enabled us to recover the living center of the Gospel, and we are profoundly grateful for this. But our task is to move out from this living center and to establish a point of contact. Dietrich Bonhoffer saw what was emerging. He spoke of modern man's coming of age, and he counseled that this man should be approached in his strength and not in his weakness. What he meant was that he should not be blackmailed into the Church or into the Kingdom. Bonhoffer had seen the numbing fear of the Nazi regime and knew its crippling effects. He knew, too, that the Church of tomorrow must be more than a refuge for those unwilling to face the future, and the hasty notes that were smuggled from his prison cell give us a clue to the point of contact with the new man. It lies in a humanity that is common to us all and involves a humanism that is truly Christian. Classical humanism taught that man's humanity is innate, something inherited at birth, a thing complete and autonomous when one comes into the world. But Biblical humanism speaks of one's humanity as something to be possessed and offers man the possibility of becoming a complete man in Jesus Christ.

Karl Barth has written recently of the humanity of God, and John Calvin called Jesus Christ the mirror of mankind. Christ is the revelation not only of God to man but also of man to himself. Our humanity thus is an eschatological concept and can only be possessed through Jesus Christ. Hence Paul could write to the Romans that whom God "did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son," and the "complete man" in Ephesians has the same destination in Christ. He is the man of destiny, one who is a man and has given a destiny through the grace of Jesus Christ. Our task is to proclaim Him who is the true image of mankind and the sole source of power by which this new age which He has brought into being may be populated by persons who are not shriveled and shrunken but who have found their wholeness in Him.

The great question that confronts our Church today must be articulated and answered without further delay. Are we willing to accept this age as God's gift, enter into it joyfully, and fulfill the mission of Christ to the world in the world? Our era is pre-Christian —do not buy the myth of a post-Chris-

tian era! Christians are still a minority and the mission of the Church has only begun. What is needed is "Christians, who remain Christians," to use a phrase of Albert Camus. In a powerful essay in his posthumously-published *Resistance, Rebellion, and Death* Camus exclaims: "What the world expects of Christians is that Christians should speak out loud and clear; for between the forces of terror and the forces of dialogue, a great unequal battle has begun." Notice his grouping, the forces of dialogue, men who acknowledge other men as persons, against the forces of terror. "We are still waiting, and I am waiting, for a grouping of all those who refuse to be dogs, and are resolved to pay the price that must be paid so that man can be something more than a dog."

The future does not belong to the fearful, for those who fear most believe least. The future belongs to those who resolutely move forward to possess their humanity and seek its fulfillment in the service of others because they have been possessed by the Author of their humanity and have been claimed by Him.

"The world is discovering the Church, and the Church is rediscovering itself, as the mission and ministry to the world and its need become evident and are pursued. The imperative to communicate the Gospel is at the heart of mission and ministry, for the Gospel shows us who we truly are, gives us the clue to our human situation, gathers us into a community of faith, witnesses to the presence of the power of the Holy Spirit for the guidance of our personal and corporate experience, calls us to discipleship in the meeting the world's needs together, and establishes our eternal hope. The Gospel thus communicated is the renewing power that the Church requires today."

—D. Campbell Wyckoff, in *Theory and Design of Christian Education Curriculum*, Westminster, Phila., 1961, p. 19.

MEDIEVAL STUDIES IN A PROGRAM OF REFORMED THEOLOGY

Georges A. Barrois

This is a new venture. Princeton Theological Seminary, which often had to face the accusations, or self-accusations, of stagnating, is developing a program of studies in the historical and doctrinal aspects of the Ancient and Medieval Church. Plans regarding the field of Patristics are admittedly still in the fluid stage of long-range prospects. Yet circumstances of a more or less occasional nature have brought about the crystallization of corporate constructive thinking for an intensified study of the history and theology of the Medieval Church. Some may insinuate that a more sensible order would be to provide first for Patristics, and second for Medievalism. Some will object that this is a peculiar way of breaking up the so-called stagnation of our theological curriculum by seemingly moving backwards into the past. Be it as it may, there is a general consensus involving a majority, I hope, of Trustees, Faculty, and Students, not to speak of the "Church at large," that it is a fallacy to think that we should start every day from scrap and work ahead, oblivious of what has happened before, under the spur of the moment, or on the uncertain advice of crystal-ball gazers. This would be, indeed, a queer way of cooperating with Providence and Eternal Wisdom. The Church is called to move on a God-given course, not to flee ahead before wind and current. And if it is to be kept on course, then a piece of dead reckoning is in order.

This means, to put it bluntly, that we realize once and for all that Christianity did not begin with the Reformation, that any appraisal of what the Christian Church is or ought to be today calls for scrutinizing, both sympathetically and critically, the life and thought of the Church of yesteryears, and that a due measure of attention must be given to the "horizontal dimension" which the Theology of Crisis was prone to disregard. I owe our guests an apology for using this geometrical lingo, which will be readily understood by the inmates of this campus. What I want to say is that, although our Christian faith is not the product of historical determinism, yet its expression, and the development of Christian thought and life, have been unavoidably, I should say providentially, influenced, modified, reshaped, and remodelled by historical factors. If it were not so, then Christianity would be either a mysticism, in the loose sense, or an ideology without much contact with the human predicament, and therefore ineffective and perhaps misleading, an *ignis fatuus*.

Now, the Reformation is a particular phenomenon of Western Church history, and cannot be properly evaluated without a thorough knowledge of the life and thought, the glories and the sins, of the Older Church, I mean before the Council of Trent. And again, Western Medieval Christianity cannot

be fully understood without reference to its Eastern counterpart, from which it has allowed itself to become estranged. It should not be necessary here to insist on the relevancy of the new program with regard to the ecumenical movement. Here again I must apologize for this term, which, most unfortunately, has been cheapified to mean an artificial union of denominations in view of a not-too-well-defined common endeavor, and that, of course, is not enough. We would rather think in terms of the all-embracing reality of the Communion of Saints, binding together Christians of all times, cultures, and regions of the earth. It is an article of the Creed, and we need not be apologetic about it.

Addressing now the theological Students, I wish to add that a program of Medieval studies implies that there is no giving priority and still less exclusive attention to the latest theologian whose works happen to have been written in, or translated into, English, under the pretense that we want to be up to date, in order to communicate with that *ens rationis* which is called the "modern man." The prehistory of many a Reformed doctrine brings us back to problems and issues discussed by Medieval scholars, who unfortunately wrote in Latin. Incidentally, Roman Catholic academic authorities are increasingly aware of the sad fact that even their students do not master that language any more; they just go by, and, in order to meet their needs, the program of translation of Medieval works and fragments into English has been stepped up. That will be for you an indirect benefit of generalized ignorance.

For me, personally, the new venture in which I am called in to participate is more like a home-coming. My first theological contacts were with Aquinas and the Schoolmen. Various circumstances, and probably a certain interest acquired during two years of soldiering in Syria at the end of World War I diverted me to another field, namely Biblical Archaeology—strictly dirt and dust archaeology—, a twelve year interlude, as I see it now, till I was ready to come back to Beatrice, *nel mezzo del camine della vita.*

The fact that a program of Medieval Studies at Princeton is a new undertaking makes it that I do not have a predecessor in the chair whom to eulogize. But let me take the opportunity gratefully to recall the memory of the late Father Mandonnet, who held the chair of Medieval Church History at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland, and who, after his official retirement, filled with his rich collection of books and pamphlets all and sundry rooms, kitchen and bath included, of a little house in Meudon near Paris. He spent the last years of his life at the *Studium Generale* of the Dominicans of the Province of France, where he unselfishly shared the best of his experience with his students and colleagues in the course of many an intimate conversation. He also gave lectures, the contents of which did not necessarily correspond to the titles as announced, but which were uncommonly rich in information and insight.

* * *

I shall try, now, to answer the questions which are probably on your minds: What do we plan to do? What is it we hope to achieve? Obviously we are not to set up a course of Medieval Studies just for curiosity's sake,

because those Medieval people are so picturesque: feudalism revisited, Ivanhoe on the T.V. screen. Nor are we looking back to the thirteenth century with nostalgia, as if it were the Golden Age of Christian theology.

Gold there was, indeed. For instance, the Scriptural realism of Saint Thomas Aquinas, which alone could provide a firm, objective basis for theology as a science. Thomas stood practically alone against the prevailing allegorism of his age, infinitely popular, undoubtedly fertile, as art and poetry abundantly show, but which offered only an uncertain foundation for Christian dogmatics. Already in the twelfth Century Rupert of Deutz and Hugh of Saint Victor had sensed the danger. Aquinas gave an articulate expression to their dissent, and stated the first claim and the sufficiency of the literal, historical sense of Scripture with regard to the essentials of Christian faith, no matter how much spiritual interpretations might be useful for illustrative or homiletical purposes. The only trouble is that Brother Thomas did not always abide by his rules.

Another golden nugget, at random: Saint Thomas's conception of analogy, as the semantic process which enables theologians to make meaningful statements concerning God and his perfections, while respecting the inscrutable mystery of his being, the excess of light, or the darkness, in which he hides, and which no human eye will ever pierce. Analogy does not boast of discovering; it translates, and it names. Saint Thomas was able to assimilate the negative approach of Dionysius the Areopagite, and paradoxically to spell the divine Names of the Great Unknown. For Saint Thomas never tired of saying that we do not know what God is, nor how he is, but that we know rather what he is not, and how he is not. This negativism, which was severely criticized by the Scotists, has a certain affinity with the slogan—far too blunt—"God the Wholly Other." And I would like to point here that this concept of analogy is basically different from the *analogia entis* of Father Przywara, which our Karl Barth has set up as a strawman in his theological tiltyard.

I would give a third illustration. It has to do with Aquinas's principles of ethics, which grow, so to speak, out of his theology. We would certainly not countenance the Augustinian doctrine of the *donum superadditum* which Saint Thomas made his own. The idea that man, as he comes out of the hands of his Creator, needs something more than his natural endowments to meet the demands of life, is somehow illogical, which is bad, and unsupported by the Biblical record, which is worse. And some of us seem to have particular trouble with Aquinas' theory of Law, especially Natural Law; now I wonder whether the object of their scruple is not to be imputed to late speculations rather than to Saint Thomas himself. No matter what our reservations may be, it remains that his system of ethics, precisely because of their theological involvement, may claim to make them normative, and not a mere analysis of human behavior. We moderns have lost irretrievably this conception of theological ethics, and we are trying desperately to find a balanced substitute for it. We have not succeeded yet.

There is no need to list other instances of Thomas's acumen. This shall

be done in course of time, in the class- and seminar-room, not in order to make Thomists out of our theological students, which is neither possible nor desirable, for we cannot possibly turn the clock back, and it would do us no good anyway. There is an anonymous saying that, since Kant, it is impossible to be a Thomist. This is probably true; one cannot any longer be a Thomist in exactly the same manner as in the pre-Kantian era. Professors Maritain and Gilson cannot very well be described as "innocent" Thomists, and perhaps Aquinas himself was not.

Let me add that it would be misleading to identify Aquinas with Medieval theology. For one thing, the mid-thirteenth century is not a good starting point for a study of Medieval thought. The theology of the thirteenth was ripe, overripe. It could not grow any more. It bore in itself the deadly germs which would bring about its decay. The twelfth century was infinitely more creative, dynamic, adventurous, abundant in new schemes, some of which never developed, while some others continued being worked out systematically, or were resumed after long periods of slumber. Abelard began to come into his own as late as the nineteenth century; researches on the schools of Laon and of Saint Victor are the order of the day, and much remains to be done.

Thomism seems to have spent itself with Thomas, who did not displace the Lombard as the official authority of the School until quite late in the fifteenth century. As for his *Summa Theologica*, it had fallen prey to the commentators, who explained, explained, explained to death, and it is precisely that wooden Thomism, stiff and lifeless, which influenced the Protestant Scholasticism of the seventeenth century. This, most certainly, is not something one may wish to revive. As a matter of fact, the main effort of the Neo-Thomists aims at something quite different, namely to disentangle the philosophy of Saint Thomas from its original ties with Aristotelian physics, while historians endeavor to re-set his theological system in the complex framework of Medieval doctrine, in the hope that the forbidding monolithism of Thomism might be tempered with a reasonable amount of historical relativism and thus made serviceable for our days.

Even in its heyday, Thomism was never left unchallenged, and we forget it too often. Saint Bonaventura, the "opposite number" of Aquinas, and, as the legend has it, his friend—or is it not rather his peaceful rival, as colleagues should be—had deliberately refused to build up on the Aristotelian foundation. Etienne Gilson has made it clear that Bonaventura is not a primitive, but one who has made up his mind concerning the limitations of unengaged philosophy, and had decided against it. All wisdom and knowledge he sees as gifts from above. Philosophy is for him essentially Christian Philosophy, and we had better not call this a contradiction in terms, as we are prone to do. Bonaventura's philosophy is the exercise of reason interpreting the real in the light of Christian revelation and under the guidance of Christian faith; it is a metaphysical reflexion on Christian mysticism, if we understand mysticism as ranging from the humble experience of the lowliest act of faith, to Saint Francis's vision of the six-wing Seraph. Bonaventura, writing from the solitude of La Verna, where the vision had

taken place, describes it as a "Pass-over" beyond the human modes of knowledge. The contrast with the pedestrian ways of Thomas, whose philosophy starts from sensate experience to intellect to faith to vision, is indeed striking.

Let us pass to the next generation. Another son of Saint Francis, John Duns Scotus, of Oxford and Paris. In him we have no longer a contrast, but an active opposition to Thomism. Duns Scotus is critical of Thomas's metaphysics, which he refuses to call metaphysics at all. Thomas meant by this word that which, in the writings of Aristotle, comes after the books on physics, and this is, after all, the original meaning. Now, physics are concerned with material, concrete beings, and the ways they relate to each other. Metaphysical inquiry goes on much at the same level. Its object is the real, whether potential or actual. It deals primarily with problems of existence, rather than with the countless patterns which the human mind is apt to conceive. And this is, by the way, why Aquinas has been sometimes described as an existentialist, which is abusing the generally accepted meaning of terms.

This type of metaphysics does not satisfy Scotus. He is not willing to concentrate exclusively on the potential or the actual, which for Aquinas are alone the two modes of the real. His analysis is removed one further degree from the factual. His notion of the *ens commune* abstracts totally from existence. His is a metaphysics of pure forms. His philosophical universe has no other limits than those imposed by the principle of contradiction. It embraces all that is thinkable, and the thinkable, he insists to call it "real." Only this "real" has left contact with the ground, and this may explain the predilection of Duns Scotus for hypothetical questions such as: What would have happened if . . . —if circumstances had been different of what they actually were. Such questions, Aquinas, almost brutally, dismisses as irrelevant. We may understand also why Scotus, whose logical rigor is without par, seems at times to be satisfied with arguments of convenience based on the Absolute Power or the Sovereign Will of God, and which are, to say the least, perfectly unconvincing. I am thinking of his demonstration of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, which the Dominican theologians opposed relentlessly, until the definition of the dogma in 1854.

It remains that the sharpness of Scotist formalism, when applied to the objective data of Scripture and Tradition, probes often deeper than the common tools of Thomism, and is apt to yield a luxury of more detailed conclusions, and many more shades of thought.

The "real" of Duns Scotus was recognized for what it was, or tended to be: an aggregate of *entium rationis*, having all their being in the mind of the philosopher. The process of dissociation of the factual, the concrete, the individual, from the universe of pure mental forms, was carried to the extreme. On the one hand, the sciences of observation were freed from their involvement in metaphysics, or pseudo-metaphysics, and theology. The recognition of their autonomy is undoubtedly a factor of progress. On the other hand, the complete breakdown of metaphysics did away with the coordination of single disciplines, a coordination which the Schoolmen of the twelfth Century had

laboriously contrived with a robust optimism which could not be shared any longer. Wanted: a philosophy of science. The ad has been re-run ever since. Theology, as it had been formerly understood, was equally crippled and divorced from actual Christian living, to the extent that, in order to meet the crying need of his contemporaries, Jean Gerson would have to distinguish two types of theology, namely didactic theology and mystical theology, and that the Dominican Contenson felt impelled to write a *Theologia Mentis et Cordis.*

This all explains the frantic efforts of subsequent generations in search of a valid theory of knowledge and of a principle of ultimate authority, whether it be the Council, or the Pope, or the Bible, or the subjective authority of religious experience. And this may perhaps account also for the disintegration of our academic programs, where philosophy, or philosophies, are not on speaking terms with experimental science, where dogmatic and moral objectives are pursued independently, where theologians have little use for lawyers, or recognize in theory that a place should be made for the analysis of the principles and phenomena of spiritual life, but are unable to say which place.

* * *

The theological synthesis attempted during the Middle Ages failed. The vacuum it left has not been filled since, and there is yet no hopeful indication that a new synthesis can be worked out in a not too distant future. And there is no turning back. And yet, the Middle Ages had a Christian culture. In the days of Saint Thomas, the word "Christendom" was still meaningful. But is our twentieth century Christian, or is it not rather post-Christian, as if we were living on the afterglow of a sunset to be followed by endless night?

To be sure, thirteenth century culture was essentially Western. The geographical integrity of Christendom had already suffered a severe wound. Problems of political allegiance, questions of ecclesiastical precedence, theological bickerings, had split the Body of Christ. Westerners were looking askance at the Greeks, whose sophistication, whose Court and Church ceremonial appeared to them as "different," outlandish and heathen. The Greeks resented the unwashed soldiers and throngs of Crusaders who conquered them and plundered them under the guise of a common alliance against the mounting strength of Islam. Eastern prelates could not help thinking that the establishment of a Latin hierarchy in Constantinople, whose Patriarch was forced to move across the straits, was rather bad taste. The good William of Moerbeke, a native of Flanders and a friend of Saint Thomas, would have done much better to stick to his translations from Aristotle rather than to let himself be enthroned as Saint Paul's successor in Corinth. I sometimes come to think that we Americans have also some sort of genius for rubbing the wrong way precisely those we wish to protect or to help, whether we send marines, or technicians, or perhaps even missionaries. Now I would certainly be unfair to Medieval Christianity if I did not mention the repeated attempts at healing the wounds, on the part of Latin and Greek churchmen. Aquinas died on his way to the Ecumenical Council of Lyons which was to examine the possibility of a reunion.

Master Albert, then Archbishop of Regensburg, substituted for his former disciple, and Saint Bonaventura attended the Council. A plan of union was adopted in principle, but was torpedoed by politicians.

It would be a severe mistake to think of Western Medieval culture as monolithic and static. Quite to the contrary, the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries were an age of contrasts and changes: the age of feudalism, and the emancipation of the commons by royal franchise. The autocratic rule of the Lords, temporal and spiritual, and the rise of Parliament, le "Parloir aux Bourgeois." A deep sense for European unity in spite of precarious means of communication, and the birth of nationalisms. The gathering of Church power in the hands of the Pope, and the multiplication of reformatory synods and councils. The old and the new. The monasteries of Cluny on their hilltops, of Citeaux in their valleys, and the new foundations of the Friars, black, white, and gray, in the midst of University towns, where the secular masters had to revise their programs, if they wanted to keep their students.

At first sight, the situation seems chaotic, and challenges our assumption of a Christian culture. Yet, in this Babel, there was a superior principle of integration which kept things together, and which is sorely lacking in our modern culture, in spite of our conformism on the phenomenal level, where an Italian bathtub differs little from an American bathtub, where lawyers behave like lawyers whether in a French court or in a German court, where clergymen of every denomination wear the same Roman collar and preach the same sermons. Medieval culture was theologically integrated. Above competing ideologies, systems, power blocs, there was the unique conviction that God rules on high. This conviction was "hot"; it had lost nothing of its radioactivity. "In God we trust," "So help me God," were not pious mottoes inherited from the fathers, to be minted on currency or mumbled in courtrooms. Medieval people believed in the primacy of the spiritual, in a standard from which to judge and to test everyone and everything. They knew, and never doubted, that nothing ultimately makes sense, nothing ultimately is blessed, that proceeds not from the acknowledgment of this primacy and this standard of thought and life. Many were brutal, hot-tempered, superstitious, corrupt; the worst pranks of our university students—and they can be pretty bad at times—are lavender in comparison with the riots in the Clos Mauvoisin or the Rue du Fouarre; yet everyone knew for sure he would have to comply and to repent, even *in extremis*, if he were not to miss his last chance before eternity would close in.

Of Medieval Christianity, the Renaissance kept mostly the empty shell. God was relegated to the summit of remote Mount Olympus together with the heathen gods whom Renan had not yet rolled in their purple shrouds. Neither the Protestant Reformation, nor the Catholic Counter-Reformation, could possibly stem the tide. Eighteenth century deism still acknowledged God as the owner of the world's machine, but no longer its manager, a retired God, increasingly bored and uninterested in his ownership. The Renaissance had intoned a paean to the glory of man, or rather of an aristocratic type of man, *l'uomo unico*, wise, self-sufficient, capa-

ble, of himself and unaided, of every achievement and every progress. It was a grand vision, but visions are by nature bound to fade, and soon disillusionment set in. Broken fragments of the glorious image subsisted or were revived under any number of variations. Here are a few examples. Variation n° 1: If it cannot be seen and handled, then it does not exist. Variation n° 2: Only that which can be measured is relevant. Variation n° 3: There is no certainty, safe within the human mind, and this certainty is the pattern after which we must order our life and reshape the world. Variation n° 4: Historical determinism is the thing; what was yesterday decided of what will be tomorrow, either by direct descent, or by a dialectical game of thesis and antithesis. Variation n° 5: Man is confronted with situations; only one thing counts, that he shall decide; decide what, nobody knows for sure.

One cannot play that game indefinitely. After two world wars, colonial wars, wars of liberation, cold war, brush-fire wars, what-not-wars, we had better realize that we are pitched for Armageddon. I do not mean the Armageddon of the so-called free world against communism, I mean the last battle of the Titans against the gods, the gods who hate mankind, as it is written in Goethe's *Parzenlied*. For we are not welcome honestly to appeal to the "God who loves men," Θεός Φιλάνθρωπος, simply in order to close our eyes to the impending doom, which we prepare so efficiently.

I have no remedy to offer. Nobody has. We all know the score, and in which direction the solution lies, but we do not know how to go about it. I hope, though, that the program of work that is set before me, and to which I shall devote the rest of my active years, may be helpful, not only unto diagnosing the extent and the depth of the disease which threatens our very existence, but also unto bringing forth constructive suggestions. It is imperious that we learn to reintegrate our thought and our lives into the divine order, which is the only possible climate for humans. The question is not: "Can we?", for of ourselves we have no power. But God's order is: "We must."

THE MINISTRY OF A PRISON CHAPLAIN

E. Frederick Proelss

More than eight years as a Prison Chaplain spent in daily contact with the agents of crime have taught me some "facts of life" which vaguely I may have sensed before, but which had never entered into my consciousness with such clarity or full implications as they have now. These experiences, for which I have paid dearly with disappointments and mental pain, I believe are valuable enough to be shared with others, especially with those who, like you Princeton Seminarians, are going to assume places of influence and, I hope, leadership within the contemporary American scene.

On looking back I try to analyze the feelings and expectations which have moved me to consider, and eventually choose this work as Prison Chaplain among these disorganized and underprivileged men. It was not only the continuity which such work would promise on the one hand between the "criminal lawyer" which I had been for nearly twenty years before I entered the ministry, and on the other hand the "criminal clergyman" who I would now become, but it was also the idea that there, *in carcere et vinculis* (in jail and in chains), the *de profundis,* the "call out of the deep," would be heard more urgently than the same cry among the more comfortable, normal, and privileged people whom I would have to serve in a regular parish. This last point had in some measure been my experience: after (in the Europe of the thirties and forties) I personally had lived for years in the anticipation of and inner preparation for political arrest and incarceration, and after my long expected brush with the state police, watch-dog of the concentration camps, had finally happened. In such situations the quest for meaning had become much more urgent for me than in all the preceding years of relative comfort. Should it not be the same with other captives?

In the totalitarian prisons and camps you could still find persons who had stood up for ideals—religious, humanitarian, political, or ideological—or who had chosen to take upon themselves the consequences of just simple personal integrity and honesty. And some of them, I know, have called to God as Job had done, or like the poet of the seventy-third Psalm. But, alas, imagine the disappointment of the new Prison Chaplain. Seemingly you just do not find this type of person in the correctional institutions of the civilized world, especially within the boundaries of what we call the "free and democratic world." The sort of people who occupied the totalitarian camps are usually not thrown into prison here, and, therefore, out of the window for me went the hope that I would find here people especially hungry and calling for the heavenly bread. I had to give up the expectation that religious needs would automatically be found in so-called "extreme situations," of which the predicament of the imprisoned would be one.

Today all this seems somewhat naïve to me. But in a special way the Christian is tempted to connect thieves, pub-

licans, adultresses, and similar "sinners" with people who, deep in their heart, are so much better than the so-called "righteous" and the Pharisees. We remember so warmly the stories of the New Testament in which Jesus had taken the side of the "bad" people, the transgressors of the law, and had compared them so very favorably in their inner attitudes with the coldness of heart that he had found in many "good" people. Indeed, has he not personally elevated the common criminal, who was hanging on one of the crosses next to his own, into the Kingdom of Heaven, into Paradise—the one and only saint to whom he himself has delegated such status? Now let me say something very serious, namely, that it may be this way; but, please, do not generalize from the experiences of our Lord, or from the pointed thrust of his parables. Just being a thief or another transgressor of the civil and moral law does not necessarily make you an exceptionally good prospect for holiness. The majority of chiselers like the publicans of old, of thieves or perhaps murderers, of adultresses and prodigal sons, are just as miserable, as selfish, and as shallow as many of the so-called Pharisees. And occasionally the latter may even look somewhat better.

The more literate and widely read among us, moreover, should not draw unwise conclusions from what they have heard from writers like Dostoievski and others who claimed they had found people most close to God and of the greatest dignity of heart among the scum of the earth: in murderers like Raskolnikov and prostitutes like Sonja. Again I say it may be so in some exceptional cases, but just being an outcast from society does not automatically make you a potential spiritual giant. The sad truth is that there seem to be only very few romantic figures, noble knights, and humble saints in our prisons. As a matter of fact I am still waiting to come upon one of them. What we find, instead, in by far the majority of our prison inmates is something very different, much more prosaic and earthbound. If I would be asked to describe with one simple word the climate of prisons, and the mental world of the men who populate them, I would say that it is not potential holiness but actual and burning hostility.

I am fully aware of the fact that it is not exactly fair of me to make such a general statement. But I will hold to it. It is just as fair and true, I believe, as to call the atmosphere of all kinds of hospitals one of fear and anxiety. While in General Hospitals the clergyman will find physical suffering and pain, the helplessness of the seriously ill and disabled, and the agony of the critical cases, so in the State Hospitals he will encounter the nightmares and the anguish of mental disintegration, the terrors of the disturbed wards where the human is melting into the animal, indeed even into the vegetable. And all this together, in both types of hospitals, makes for one outstanding result: fear and anxiety. In the prisons, on the other hand, the clergyman meets the failures in all fields of life's assignments (social, occupational, sexual); he finds people with twisted and vulgar minds, full of frustrations and resentments. And all this together means, as we have already said, hostility.

I

When I speak of "hostility," I refer certainly to something much larger and

more complicated than what is found within prison walls. Indeed, more than anything else have my penitentiary years taught me what a truly basic place and status "hostility" is holding within the economy of all life. "In all life," I have said, but most especially between man and man, or the "world" as the sphere of interpersonal relationships into which you will have to carry the proclamation of the most astonishing "Good News" of God in Christ. Hostility, this synonym of all negativity, should (it seems to me) be also understood as more than only a psychological phenomenon, as more than only a subjective feeling or emotion, although it is also expressed in and through such feelings and then is referred to as anger, hate, resentment, and envy. But while encompassing it hostility reaches beyond psychology; it is a truly structural element, a basic mode or state of being.

After the impact of Søren Kierkegaard we modern theologians have learned to speak much of anxiety. Not only have we been persuaded to find in anxiety the foremost characteristic of our age, but also the most basic element and problem of human existence as such. Not that I plan to minimize the seriousness of our contemporary predicament, but after my encounter with hostility, I began to wonder whether there may not be something of a still deeper and more original nature than twentieth century anxiety. This something is, I believe, "hostility," and much of all anxiety is only a response to the primary power of such hostility. While the latter is so to speak *a priori*, anxiety is *a posteriori* and only the reactive awareness that one is surrounded by a potentially and actually hostile world, while one is at the same time, also threatened from within by internal hostilities such as well up from the depth of our own hearts. What the problem of "anxiety" has become for the theologian of today, namely, the "evil one" incarnate, had been "sex" for the generation of yesterday. Concupiscence, lust, the "devil in the flesh," had long been seen as the arch-disturber of human souls and of organized society. Alas, how "repressed" have some of our "puritan" or "victorian" grandparents been when they overlooked the fact that sex may also be the great and sacramental fulfillment of earthly love, and that it would usually be a disturber only when saturated with hostility, the elementary power of which we are now speaking. Some good theologians of old seem to have been so much wiser, when they had found in lust the least and the most innocent of the vices, and consequently prepared for the lustful (as you can read in the second part of Dante's *Divine Comedy*) the highest of the cycles of Purgatory, a place close to the peak of the "Mountain of Penance," and to the "Earthly Paradise" from which the purified soul would "leap up to the stars." No, the arch-enemy of man is not anxiety or lust or sex, it is hostility, this elementary, basic, and truly original evil and power of destructiveness.

There are people certainly who would not accept such structural, *a priori* (or however you may call it) status of hostility. They believe that hostility is only an acquired kind of disease, transmitted from person to person, group to group, generation to generation. If we could (so do they say) make people develop normally, healthily, and without unfriendly coercion from the out-

side, we would have no hostility anymore, but only friendly social-moral cooperation among men. I have found the following quotation, attributed to Herbert Hoover, the former President of the United States, "If we had just one generation of properly born, adequately educated, healthy children, developed in character, we would have Utopia itself." Utopia, indeed, I can only add.

We find, however, many keen observers of man and the world who take a much more dim view of hostility. One of them was the father of psycho-analysis, Sigmund Freud. You know Freud started his theories by focusing on sexual drives and that he did not squarely face the vital importance of hostility till late in life when he was unable to give to it the same detailed attention which he had given to the libidinal impulses. To the latter (which he called later the forces of *Eros*), Freud opposed finally all the instincts toward aggression and destruction as the forces of death (*Thanatos*). Writing about this, his "death instinct," Freud said,

"I take up the standpoint that the tendency toward destruction and aggression is innate, and an independent instinctual disposition in man, and that it constitutes the most powerful obstacle to culture."

Some persons who would not share Freud's "death instinct" with its biological or chemical basis, have accepted this concept on an ontological basis. Death, and with it hostility and destruction, is here taken as the most obvious fact and form of the threat on "Non-Being." Life and Being is threatened at any moment by Death and Nothingness, whereby the latter is an inseparable part of the first. Here and today I can not go into a discussion of ontology. Enough that also many a modern philosopher teaches us to accept hostility, aggression, and destructiveness as inevitable, as basic, and as structural.

And how do we Christians, informed by the Scriptures, look at the problem of hostility? Certainly not very different from the patriarch of modern depth-psychology and from Heidegger and Sartre. We are told instead that the history of hostility and destructiveness began with the history of our planet. We hear the voice of envy and destruction when the serpent speaks to Eve in the Garden of Eden. We know the great symbol of the Fall, which points out how original hostility had led to original sin. And in the fourth chapter of Genesis already is told the story of the first murder, the story of Cain and Abel.

After I have said all this, I hasten to add that in stressing the universality and inevitability of hostility and of destructiveness, I certainly did not mean to belittle the fact that a very powerful source of hostility lies also in what we may call "adjustment disorders" during infancy and childhood. There can be no doubt whatsoever that destructiveness of attitude and behavior is developed and strengthened during the course of faulty upbringing of a youngster in his family (i.e., between child and parents), and in his neighborhood (i.e., between family and the larger environment). Whenever active mismanagement or gross neglect of human needs, influences of "bad" company, and of a corrupt society or sub-society, there will hostility grow and overshoot itself. But all this is only "reactive hostility," an epiphenomenon and conse-

quence of psychological frustrations, and should as such be distinguished from that inevitable and trans-psychological phenomenon of "basic hostility" which we discussed before. These two together—"basic" and "reactive" hostility—decide the amount and intensity of hostility which is brooding in a person.

And now to come back to where we started. Let me add that crime and its agents, the criminals, are only one manifestation of hostility among others, although outwardly the most visible. For, as different as amount and intensity of hostility may be in different individuals, just as different are the ways a person will express his hostility. And this brings me from the question of the origin, the *having* of hostility, to the question of the *expression* of hostility.

In the case of the criminal the handling of hostilities seems rather uncomplicated; he freely acts them out, and he does it in a so-called "anti-social" behavior, directed against the person or the property of other individuals or toward society at large. The true criminal is distinguished by the fact that he has accepted his hostilities and that he deliberately has chosen their anti-social expression. Certainly there are crimes committed whose agents had been carried away unwillingly by an outburst of their impulses or by the pressures of their compulsions, and who had not openly accepted their hostilities, nor acted them out with premeditation. Much has been made of such definitely psychiatric cases in novels, movies, and articles, but in reality they represent only a very minor fraction of our high rate of crime. Criminologists and court psychiatrists have assured us that nearly 90 per cent of all committed crimes are performed by persons who act freely, who use their anti-social conduct for a livelihood, and make it a career.

Much greater difficulties with the acceptance and expression of their hostilities than the professionals of crime are those of the usually law-abiding people. Hostility is difficult for most average people to accept and to handle. This is so because by experience we have learned that to express hostility is to invite retaliation and loss of love. We have also been taught, and do remember, that hostility is unethical. For these reasons the better socialized people have developed various inner barriers and defenses against their hostilities, of which "repression" is the most widely used and best known. But it often requires so much effort to keep pent-up hostility out of consciousness and from overt expression that people pay a high price for such repression. Not only are our more positive feelings blocked by repressive handling of hostilities and healthy adjustments prevented, but we occasionally develop additional, unpleasant symptoms. "Neurosis," for example, is most often a deviate expression of hostility, a hostility which contrary to that of the aggressive criminal, is not always acted out in anti-social ways and against the larger society. Instead, hostility is here dealt with in a private way, in a form where we ourselves become the target and victim of our own destructiveness. In other words, the hostile but self-repressive person, by turning his hostilities against himself (instead of acting them out against others), develops symptoms like severe anxiety-neurosis or profound moody depressions.

To complete the picture, let me also mention that the so-called "psycho-

somatic disorders" are further examples of an unsuccessful handling of hostilities. We all know by now that peptic ulcers, for example, are self-imposed and are the end-result of a chronic bottling-up of hostilities and their transformation into personal physical illness.

So much then for the first great lesson which my years as a prison chaplain have taught me, and which I have found important enough to be shared with you: the story of the tremendous and manifold role which hostility is playing in the household of human life. When you will enter soon your professional "vineyards," you should know that here, and nowhere else you will find the arch-enemy. Hostility is rampant in the world outside, and also lurking deep in your own hearts and minds.

II

Let us come back now to the main concern, and ask ourselves what else we could learn from the agent of crime.

When we try to understand what crime as an inwardly accepted and outwardly expressed hostility is in its most crucial meaning, we shall have to face up to the fact that the criminal way of life is not limited to those persons who have been caught and are now imprisoned. We shall also have to learn that the crux of criminal attitudes and behavior can not adequately be described in legal terms, such as the commission of something prohibited by law, or the omission of something that is required by law. Instead it is my opinion that, in order to grasp the essence of crime and of the criminal, the delinquent, or the offender, we shall have to go beyond legal, and finally beyond psychological and sociological definitions also. We shall have to break through both, juridical and scientific parlance, towards the transcending realm of the qualitative, towards an understanding of crime as a *value problem*. Currently we hear a good deal more about values than ever before. It is significant that also among our psychologist friends who earlier had claimed to be scientists of the soul, and therefore value-neutral, we find lately a growing interest in values. Values are concerned with what is good, and since man can hardly live without having some concept of what makes life worthwhile, we can correctly assume that at no time he will be without some sort of values. Since this is so, you may expect me to be more precise when I suggest we examine the criminal as a value problem. What kind of values do I mean? At this stage let me say merely that I understand crime as a problem of cultural and spiritual values. But before I explore this point further, we shall first have to deal with the psychology of crime. So far we have spoken widely in "trans-psychological" terms, but the criminal is certainly a psychological problem also.

In his search for the basic psychology of the agent of crime, the prison chaplain is not without some help. We find in our penal institutions inmates of a very special personality structure, people who will help us ascertain what we are looking for. The hostile, anti-social person whose mentality I will now describe, has been called by many a name. Names like "morally insane," "constitutional psychopathic personality," or just "psychopath," are only the most frequently found. Knowing that any and each of such labels could be criticized, I will settle for the most obvious fact: that these individuals are "abnormal," irregular, i.e., pathological in

the social dimensions and therefore I'll call them "sociopaths." This, by the way, is also the term which more recently has been selected by the American Psychiatric Association to describe the character-disordered person of whom we are speaking. You should also know that there exist many forms, masks, and degrees of sociopathy. I will not, and cannot go into details, except to say that there is a wide *continuum* of the criminal mentality. What I can do for our present purpose is to describe the heart of the matter in some broad lines. I will do that by comparing the sociopath with other forms of psychological pathology, and then by setting the features which characterize him in contrast to the others.

Speaking in such broad and contrasting terms, we have first to say that sociopathy is a chronic and most often a lifelong pattern of behavior and reaction. It is a "style of life" and character defect, and this means it is for the individual a customary way of acting or his habitual mode of adjustment. This quality distinguishes character disorders like sociopathy from psycho-neurotic disturbances, in which an otherwise relatively integrated person is suddenly overcome by an influx of personality-alien, destructive desires, impulses, and compulsions. All the latter are in contrast to the neurotic's usual style of life and character, and they bring to him a sense of profound mental pain, of anxiety and distress, of guilt feelings and possibly a need to be punished, or to expiate. Very often anxieties in the form of guilt-feelings are the hallmark of neurosis. The sociopath, on his part, does not know such anxieties and guilt-feelings. If he should have feelings of inner discomfort and conflict at all, then there is good reason to assume that this is not because of *what* he has done, but because of *how* he did it, namely, so badly that he had been outwitted and that he had been caught.

Furthermore, sociopathy does not represent a kind of insanity, a lack or loss of reality contact. It is not a breakdown of the personality-organization with a resultant withdrawal and retreat into a private world of the individual's own making, a world of delusions and hallucinations, as it distinguishes the classic *psychoses*. No, it is not that the sociopath's inner life would crack, that his inner, unconscious world would flood upwards and overwhelm objective and realistic perception, thinking, and feeling, and as this all happens to the afore-mentioned psychotic person. On the contrary, the sociopath's frame of reference is intact, and in excellent contact with external reality, the world of harsh realities. And the sociopath knows full well also how to deal with such naked facts, how to take advantage of people and of situations. Furthermore, he does not withdraw, he attacks, and he hits out. In short, the sociopath knows very well how to operate all worldly realities and conditions. As a matter of fact, his manipulative mode of acting is one of the most outstanding features of sociopathy.

Finally, just as little did sociopathy mean a lack of "realism," so little does it mean a general lack of *intelligence*. It may be so with some individuals, but more often do we find intelligent, occasionally even highly intelligent people among the character-disordered sociopaths, the so-called "smart and shrewd guys." After these three negative demarcations (no neurotic, no psychotic, no blockhead) we should add a more

positive description. We could say that the sociopath is extremely selfish, narcissistic, and that he seems to be unable to identify himself with others in feelings and attitudes. He lacks community-spirit and consequently is remorseless in his dealings with others. He disregards the rules of fair play, seems to be barren of decent, tender, and generous feelings, and is not hampered by an appreciation of sympathetic relations and loyalties. If he should have a kind of philosophy, one could assume that the character-disordered sociopath sees the world as an essentially hostile "dog eat dog" affair, merciless, tricky, dangerous, possibly also as meaningless, i.e., "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing," and that his conclusions are: only you yourself count, and either you take advantage of others, or others will take advantage of you. He assumes quite evidently that, except for crooks of his own type, except for the "getters and go-getters," constituted society consists of either "phonies" or of "suckers" only.

In short, these people called sociopaths represent a sad and unpleasant group. What makes the picture still more distressing is that their destructive, hostile conduct is often covered up by a charming, disarming manner, daring attitudes, or by good and youthful looks. But worst of all is that in prisons we find only the least successful of them, those with especially poor judgment, or of a more violent disposition. Those with more foresight and more effectual brakes on their hostilities, manage to avoid the open clash with the laws of society and consequently remain in the open spaces, as a kind of adaptive or socialized sociopath. Here we find them among all sorts of male and female climbers, sharpies, and parasites, as outwardly respectable but unprincipled politicians, public officials, and private businessmen, as unscrupulous Labor Union leaders, Medical Doctors, and Lawyers, we find them among the wide assortment of "white collar" swindlers and chiselers, tax evaders and hard-pressing promoters, till we reach the fringes of the "Genial Society" with its soldiers of fortune, gigolos, and other "cool cats." They are the aggressive manipulators of sundry causes, mouthpieces of many frauds and deceits, abusers of other persons' adherence to cultural values and of innumerable human needs or confusions, often cultivating the confidence, or gullibility of others, with the intent to turn it into their own personal advantage, and to betray it whenever profitable. In short, they are the manipulators, managers, and exploiters in nearly every field of human experience, from racketeer-land even to the religious or ecclesiastical domain.

All this has brought me to the crux of the whole matter. The hostile mind of the anti-social agent is not one lacking in intelligence or sanity. What is missing is moral fiber and moral values. The sociopath is afflicted with the defect of irresponsibility, not irrationality or stupidity. If this is so then we can under no circumstances any more accept the thesis that the character-disordered persons are basically "sick" people. It is a great fallacy of many psychologists and psychiatrists and, under their influence, of wide parts of the contemporary body-society, to translate all kinds of human phenomena (also those who belong into the dimension of cultural or spiritual values) into the language of so-called science, i.e., to neu-

tralize or debunk them and to throw them into the morally indifferent frame of medical phraseology, so that everything becomes finally "sick, sick, sick." Instead, we have learned to understand the sociopathic pattern, this paragon of accepted and freely expressed hostility, as a defect in the spiritual sphere, the dimension of moral and cultural values.

In a very real sense each human being is by nature a sociopath and potential criminal. We come into the world not as civilized beings, but with what we can call "fallen" mankind's savage and barbaric heritage. No baby is an angel, but a bundle of wild and completely selfish energies. To grow into a civilized being, man has to learn, to accept, and to integrate social-moral values. The deposit of such values in civilized man, the gyroscope of his behavior, the set of ideas and ideals in accordance with which he lives his life, is called man's "conscience." And if that is so, then must it be the burden of such conscience to (among other duties) come to grips with man's hostilities, to control and direct, and possibly to transform them from destructive to constructive expression. To say some words about the uniquely human phenomenon called the conscience will be the task of the last part of my presentation. With it we will, finally, come from what we may call the ontology of hostility and the psychology of crime to the control and therapy of both of them.

III

Our Christian tradition gave to Western man his most distinctive trait when it proclaimed the glory of his conscience. Biblical man, always seen as created in the image of God, received his highest status when St. Paul introduced into the body of the Holy Scriptures (and with that into our daily language) the concept of *syneidesis, conscientia,* or conscience. As I understand it, this conscience is where we find the seat of all cultural values and the judge over all decisions of an ethical quality, i.e., considered standards as to what is right or wrong, what is good and what is blameworthy or evil.

The question then arises whether this conscience is a special and inborn organ or capacity of man which provides him with an immediate knowledge of moral norms? An absolute, inner source of ethical principles and an unerring guide to what is right or wrong? In other words: Is the conscience some kind of universal "inner voice," a knowledge of the moral law as from the beginning written in man's heart, and given to him "by nature" (as St. Paul could be understood in Romans 2:15), an absolute *a priori* consciousness of moral obligations, a "categorical imperative" to live by (as Immanuel Kant has actually assumed)? Or is the conscience not in-born but acquired, a functioning, controlling agency of man which has its individual genesis, which is learned and not immediately given, and as such the slowly evolving result of cultural transmission and personal incorporation of moral values? If this latter is the case, then conscience would neither be an eternal, structural inner voice, nor would it be the call of an *a priori* given moral imperative, but instead historically (environmentally) fashioned and conditioned, and susceptible to being modeled and formed according to different cultural (or subcultural) systems and settings. The understanding of the sociopathic per-

sonality will widely depend on whether the one or the other is the case.

The findings of modern science suggest irresistibly that the moral sense of man, his altruistic self, is the late product of a long and leisurely evolution, and that the contents of such moral consciousness as the "conscience" holds them, are never *a priori* given but always acquired, although a vague disposition to social behavior may be innate. I think all this can be reconciled with the Biblical understanding of man's nature, of "man" who was once created in the image and, therefore, in the possession of a direct, intuitive, *a priori* knowledge of God and of his Will for him, who, however, *fell* from his original nature. But even in his fallen state man had been left with the potentiality to develop a moral self, and God has also shown anew his Will for him, and revealed the rules and values of the life to which man should aspire. To repeat all this in one sentence: man has the "potentiality" to develop a moral self, and the "disposition" to social growth, but to have a "conscience" presupposes the actualization of a mere disposition.

The conscience as an acquired and learned (not instinctive and given) reality allows us to understand the hostile sociopath as a failure in conscience formation, as the final outcome of lacking or faulty value education. After the great confusion caused by our behavioral scientists about what "crime" may be, we can now make the somewhat trite and equally obvious discovery that the by far greatest part of all open or hidden criminality (among it, certainly, Juvenile Delinquency) is *not* caused by mental sickness or by extremes of poverty as such. Instead, persons in whom we fail to inculcate religious, moral, and social values, are most likely to lack them. Man has the potentiality to develop a conscience, but he needs to be introduced to the higher value system of the larger group in which he is living. Where such teaching and instruction does not happen, or where the larger group itself has become uncertain of basic values, and consequently has developed a collective instability or pathology, there and then we see arising the "sociopathic pattern." The result is a fragmentary, easy or distorted conscience, a developmental defect in the spiritual dimension of man that in many cases can never fully be re-conditioned or re-habilitated.

As a result of our discussion, the problem of treatment and prevention of hostile sociopathy is boiling down to these two basic points: a) to keep so-called reactive or pathological hostility at a minimum, while using "basic or structural" hostility as much as possible for constructive ends; and b) to watch that the constitutive values of our culture (and these are based on the Hebrew-Christian tradition) are upheld, i.e., are taught and acted upon, both in public and private life. Since reactive hostility begins at home, it will be reduced when child parent relationships are as favorable as possible. How this may be reached could be learned from a good and psychologically informed counselor. Such a person may tell us also how hostility could be reduced in grown-up persons, either through individual therapy or by constant and honest self-observation and discipline. I may add here that we will be helped when we are holding before our eyes at all times a vision of what we are meant to be by our Creator.

The other form of human destructiveness, basic-structural hostility, this indissoluble residue of life on earth, will

partly have to be suffered in private ways, while partly it could also be diverted or transformed towards constructive ends, i.e., for the welfare of others. The surgeon who satisfies his basic hostility by cutting human beings is well off, although he stands as an isolated example. However, freely accepted basic hostility could also be used to attack social evils and to crusade for human rights.

Just as important as the coming-to-grips with our hostilities is our standing-up for the values incorporated in a good conscience. We Christians are in no uncertainty whatever as to what such "good conscience" is, and the proper moral values which reside in it. In the book of Micah, we read, "God has showed you, O man, what is good" (namely, "to be just, and kind, and to live in quiet fellowship with God." Moffat). And our Lord has repeated it in his "Two Great Commandments." But, besides having been shown and told, we will also have to realize the proper moral values in our life on this earth—we "religious professionals" more than anyone else.

I believe that the most convincing and lasting impression which the prison chaplain can make on his inmates will be found not in what he says, but in what he is. The convicts, worldly wise and sophisticated in all deceits, have an uncanny way of sensing the "phony" who does not live what he is preaching. And, I trust, that this is not too different in the more conventional parishes. As dangerous as it would be theologically to separate rigidly faith from works, so is it to believe we could separate personality from behavior, just as if the expressions of a person in his conduct and deeds would have nothing to do (nothing whatever) with his inner being. The truth is that a human mind is known by its manifestations, as the Biblical tree was known by its fruits.

But except to live exemplarily, we all have also to proclaim the *Kerygma*, and we have to do it at a special place and moment in history. The proclamation of the Christian message will always be influenced, not in substance but in emphasis, by the changing historical scene. In Russia you may have to stress other aspects than in the United States. And I assure you, my young colleagues, that your proclamation here this mid-century can, and will have to find its special emphasis. Something has gone wrong here, and it threatens to go worse. After our discussion today, you will understand me when I fear that many forms of sociopathy are caused and encouraged by certain aspects of the contemporary collective consciousness of our society. Too many voices of gloom have been already raised and I too could feel happy to join in them. However, if it is occasionally profitable to call a spade a spade, then allow me to say why I am filled with such great fear.

Too many of the morals and the values of our religious tradition have been allowed to go down the drain. There is the unbelievable stress upon material success as the measure of human accomplishments, the cult of efficiency, the whole philosophy of the "fast buck," the passion and desire for easy gain and pleasure, the lack of sensitivity as to double-standards in personal and business life with its practice of, for example, price-fixing and bribing, the whole shady climate of gray-flanneled morality so shockingly described in Frank Gibney's book *The Operators*, not to forget the moral shakiness of even University professors and students who

participate in rigged television shows or sport events. In a recently published book (*The End of Ideology,* by Daniel Bell) you can find a chapter that is called "Crime as an American Way," a chapter in which the author, describing certain characteristics of our economy and politics, has given (what Prof. Schlesinger of Harvard in a book-review called) "a brilliant account of the criminal career as a means of upward mobility in American society." When I take this chapter, together with the already mentioned book of Mr. Gibney, I truly cannot wonder at or doubt what my prisoners tell me again and again: that they did not do much else or worse than more privileged people had done who got away with it lightly.

Am I, therefore, wrong to be afraid that the moral climate of our body-social has come dangerously close to being "sociopathic," and is in danger of becoming even more so? Sometimes I feel deep anxiety over how painfully unsuited Hebrew-Christian ethics may be found when it comes to facing what is developing into a modern consensus, a consensus that is revealed in the evident change from a public philosophy of responsibility to one of expediency, from an ethics of creativeness to one of leisure, from an economy of production to one of consumption.

However all that may be, you and I have made our commitments and we have taken the risk to live accordingly. We believe that the cause which we proclaim is resting on greater authority than do the shifting ideologies of historical episodes. Destructiveness and hostility may be primary, but compared to the powers of creativity and love they are still only penultimate. And, on the rampage as sociopathy may be, the resources of decency and integrity are still great; we have only to tap them. Therefore let us not be afraid to be called "prophets of doom" or "moralists." More than the peace-giving promises of Christianity, there is room today for its prophetic challenges.

This is the sum and total of the experiences which I, a Prison Chaplain, would share with you. The place of my ministry has made me more sensitive to the dangers of hostility and sociopathy, of defective consciences and values, as any other place could have done. I trust that from my vantage-point I can see the signs of our period much clearer than those whose senses have not been sharpened to its dangers. In an era like ours, I also believe, we need nothing more than a loud call and "recall" to ethics and responsibility. Since the "transvaluation of all values" which we have to proclaim is (contrary to the one which Nietzsche-Zarathustra had hailed) one of return to the spiritual values of the Christian tradition is one of greater strictness, austerity and discipline in matters of morals and religion I would like to call it the proclamation of a broadened and enlightened "puritanism." For all of us who in our times are willing not only to proclaim but also to live according to such a transvaluation of values, the Holy Spirit is not a magic, peace giving power which takes us out of, and away from this world and century. The Spirit is instead a new possibility of life, opened by the grace of God, a life of ever new moral decisions, and the freedom to realize them here and now. As such he is also a norm of, and a call to practical behavior, the guiding conscience for pilgrims of a dark and uncertain star.

THE CHRISTIAN EDUCATION OF CONSCIENCE

C. Ellis Nelson

W. H. Auden, in a recent poem, "Goodbye to Mezzogiorno," begins

"Out of a gothic north, the pallid children
Of a potato, beer-or-whisky
Guilt culture, we behave like our fathers and come
Southward into a sunburnt otherwhere
Of vineyards, baroque, la bella figura,
To those feminine townships where men
Are males and siblings untrained in a ruthless
Verbal infighting as it is taught
In Protestant rectories upon drizzling
Sunday afternoons, no more as unbathed
Barbarians out for gold, nor as profiteers
Hot for Old Masters, but for plunder."

The suggested image is clear: Protestant guilt-culture, self-justifying and aggressive, is not yet civilized. Social scientists also characterize European and Western cultures as guilt-axis cultures, usually contrasting them with shame-cultures such as primitive or oriental. In most cases, the distinguishing feature of such a classification scheme is that guilt-axis cultures create an internal conscience that is obeyed in order to avoid guilt. Shame-axis cultures externalize the social code so that a person is shamed if he does not obey its demands but feels little, if any, guilt if he disobeys. This method of classifying cultures in the social sciences is being reconsidered as being too stylized, particularly in regard to the so-called shame-cultures. However, there seems to be a general agreement that the Western industrialized culture is a guilt-producing culture.[1] Auden's words, "ruthless verbal infighting as it is taught in Protestant rectories upon drizzling Sunday afternoons," leave us with the image that Protestantism is what Karl Heim said it was—"a religion of conscience."

Justification for this remark is found in three major assumptions that have characterized much of Protestant thought: that conscience is the proof of God, the voice of God, and the basis of a practical Christian ethic.

The idea that conscience is the proof of God is expressed by a contemporary writer using these words:

> "Conscience is the ineradicable witness to God in the heart of man: it is an independent inner conviction of man's responsibility to God for his conduct; and it is planted in his very being by the Creator himself. . . . God has not permitted man to separate himself completely and absolutely from his Creator. . . . Conscience is the bond which preserves a connection between God and Man."[2]

[1] G. Piers and M. B. Sinder, *Shame and Guilt*, C. C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill., 1953, pp. 76-79.

[2] A. M. Rehwinkel, *The Voice of Conscience*, Concordia, St. Louis, 1956, pp. 22, 23.

Many other writers use less precise language, yet when their back is to the wall and the fighting becomes serious, they use the ultimate weapon—the Kantian dictum that the starry heavens above and the moral law within witness to the existence of God.

The notion that conscience is the voice of God is well described in these words:

> "We can, therefore, define conscience as that knowledge or consciousness by which man knows that he is conforming to moral law or the will of God. Our conscience tells, therefore, not only what we are but also what we ought to be."[3]

The affirmation that conscience is a basis of a practical ethic, a built-in regulatory device that, properly understood, will guide us safely through the stormy waters of decision, is widely held in Protestantism. Maurice is sure that conscience is simply this: It is that in me which says, I ought or I ought not.[4] He is so confident of his position that he can abandon rules for conscience and view the role of the casuist as a type of moral physician, one who helps to eradicate evils that sicken conscience or who works to preserve moral health so that conscience can work effectively to tell a person what is right or wrong. Kirk follows St. Thomas in saying that conscience is "the mind making moral judgments." This is based on the medieval tradition that there are two elements in conscience: First, there is an intuitive grasp of first principles by which moral judgments can be made, and second, there is a process of applying these principles to gauge the morality of any act. This position leads Kirk, as it did his Roman Catholic predecessors, to a rational ethic resulting in a fairly definite set of regulations.[5]

I

Our Modern Understanding of Conscience

A. *Description of Conscience*

Can Protestantism rest its case on conscience as illustrated in the three affirmations just cited? Our modern understanding of conscience makes us apprehensive about any structure of religious faith built on such an insecure foundation; but let us briefly trace out the origin of conscience and note its function in human life today in order to indicate the limited value of conscience for the Christian life.

Adolph Portmann has a striking statement of why so much comes to the baby from society. Man's birth is physiologically a premature birth, Portmann says. By this, he means that not until the end of one full year of life is a baby as mature as like mammals when they are born. More than any other living thing, man is shaped by his environment. Society, or the "given" in life, is represented to the baby by his parents, especially his mother. He soon learns that there is an order of things that must be followed in order to get love and approval; there are other things he must avoid doing in order to avoid disapproval and punishment. The baby's morality is based on authority—an external "given." Yet the relationship is also one of love, for the baby is

[3] O. Hallesby, *Conscience*, Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1933, pp. 12, 13.

[4] F. D. Maurice, *The Conscience*, Macmillan, New York, 1883, p. 27.

[5] Kenneth E. Kirk, *Conscience and Its Problems*, Longmans, Green & Co., N.Y., 1927, p. 379.

loved and fondled. As he grows, he internalizes the regulatory authority within himself and conscience is formed. In Freudian terms, this is the superego. As a child grows, much of his conscience becomes unconscious and restrictive. Perhaps we should, for the purposes of this paper, call this the negative conscience. In this sense, conscience is extremely moral; for, when that internalized code is violated, guilt is precipitated and this happens even when the process is going on in our unconscious mind. The capacity to develop a conscience is innate, but the code of conscience will come from society. In this sense, Durkheim is profoundly right in saying "everything that is found in conscience comes from society." Later the child accepts the more positive principles by which his parents live; and they are internalized in an area of his personality that is referred to as the ego-ideal, or, for purposes of this paper, the positive conscience. These positive principles are more accessible to the ego than the negative conscience. Perhaps the negative conscience was formed first and, therefore, lies deeper in the personality. Perhaps the baby when spanked, corrected or restrained thought that there was something wrong with him as a self rather than with his action; perhaps the baby did not realize that his parents could love him even if they had to correct him. All of these explanations have been offered to help us understand why the negative is so much more powerful than the positive and why it was driven underground in our unconscious mind.

The negative conscience is restrictive because it is trying to avoid guilt, and guilt is a reaction we cannot stand —because our negative conscience expects punishment or disapproval. The positive conscience is expansive and is more open to education because it partakes of our conscious goals with which we associate our well-being. Not to live up to our goals creates shame, but shame does not have to be expurgated as guilt does. Shame causes us to want to do better, to re-think our situation or to re-group our efforts to try again. We shall consider shame more fully later on in this paper.

B. *How Negative Conscience Affects the Religious Life*

Our problem now is how the negative conscience affects the religious life. We must consider the negative conscience because it is so powerful. It stands over us as tyrant with a bullwhip who sharply stings any infraction of the rules with a lash of guilt. Furthermore, the negative conscience is so intimately interwoven in the fabric of our being that it is not only easy, it is natural to intermingle the content of our negative conscience with the Christian faith. Let's look at faith, goodness, and justice to see how this can happen.

1. *Faith.* It is easy to see how the internalized code of behavior which operates so forcefully in our adult life would cause us to reason that it represents a practical and ineradicable testimony to God. Perhaps, in a sense, that is true for we came to a sense of sin through our self-consciousness; and through mature experience we come to a realization of the necessity for a moral ordering of our society. But if faith is based on conscience, then faith becomes regulation, an ordering of the moral life by prohibition.

The memory recorded as the earliest in the Bible is a memory related to

what was denied, a prohibition that the fruit of a certain tree was not to be eaten by Adam or Eve. Is this not a parable related to our own experience? Our earliest conscious memory is often of what was denied. The regulatory precepts of the Old Testament are mainly stated in the negative. Once we start the religious life here we will, if history be our guide, end in casuistry. The Jewish Talmud, the Roman Catholic Codes of Penance, the Protestant Puritan Ethic, all testify to our inclination for capturing religious experience and domesticating it safely within a manageable ethic. This happens because moral law becomes the authority taking the place of parents as the child becomes an adult. Thus moral and religious life is arrested in childhood. The problem for the child is no longer what God would have him do or even seeking what is right, but how to escape the whip of conscience as he faces the demands of the moral law. The external authority has moved in and has become a demanding landlord.

The social and political implications are no less discouraging, for dependence on authority can easily be transferred to an authoritarian figure or to a corporate reality such as the state. Leo Alexander, a psychiatrist at the Nuremberg trial of Nazi war leaders, tells of his conversations with many of the men on trial. He generalizes that the vast majority of the individuals who committed amoral acts and crimes were sane.[6] The state had developed a code of behavior and had reinforced it with sanctions and privileges, and these men accepted that code and accepted the state as the conscience for that code. They were in bondage to authority; and, as a result, these men rarely felt guilt because they were obeying the authority and there was nothing to be guilty about.

Thus we note the jujitsu struggle that goes on within the person. The fight is not so much between flesh and spirit or between will and ethic. It is a struggle between the conscious self and the authority that dictates to self. No group recognizes this more clearly than the Roman Catholic Church whose moral theology is built on the notion that the Church is the authority—indeed, is the conscience. They say, "You must be good in the way I teach." Thus content of conscience is supplied and authority to modify legislation is reserved for the Church acting officially.

Davis, who wrote one of the widely used textbooks for moral and pastoral theology in the Catholic Church, states it in these words:

> "The Catholic Church insists, therefore, in season and out of season on the religious education of the child, explicit, dogmatic, determinate moral education in a religious atmosphere, thus giving him something to cling to against the time of vehement temptation. It indoctrinates its children during many years, until resistance to evil becomes almost a second nature. It does not wait until the passions have grown strong, then to offer youth the free choice of religious dogmas of religious anecdotes. It says to the child: you must be good in the way I teach you to be good, so that afterwards you may know how to be good.
>
> "Any one would say that from a nat-

[6] Iago Galdston, *Ministry and Medicine in Human Relations*, International University Press, New York, 1955, pp. 92-94.

ural point of view alone this is a wise proceeding. With centuries of knowledge of human failings and proclivities in its ever-living consciousness the church knows what is best. It has not to be making experiments in order to diagnose human spiritual diseases. It knows them all both because human experience is the same in all ages, and because it has the spirit of truth to enlighten and guide it."[7]

2. *Goodness.* Goodness, likewise, presents critical problems when we understand that often we can be good because we are afraid of being bad. In such cases, we are following the dictates of conscience rather than reason or an ethical ideal. The elder brother in the parable of the prodigal son is a good illustration. After the prodigal son had come home and the joyful banquet in honor of his restoration in the family was in progress, the elder brother returned to the house and heard music and dancing. "And he called one of the servants and asked what this meant. And he said to him, 'Your brother has come, and your father has killed the fatted calf, because he has received him safe and sound.' But he was angry and refused to go in. His father came out and entreated him, but he answered his father, 'Lo, these many years I have served you and I never disobeyed your command; yet you never gave me a kid that I might make merry with my friends'" (Luke 15:26-30). Note the basis of his goodness: "I never disobeyed your command." We might label this "fierce goodness." He had to be good. The tragedy in the parable of the prodigal son is seen at the end when the elder brother makes his alienation complete by exiling himself from his father's house.

Fierce goodness can become imperialistic because a person is driven by fear of guilt. The Pharisees in Jesus' day apparently were an illustration of this compulsive goodness for in his stricture against them Jesus said, "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte, and when he becomes a proselyte, you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves" (Matthew 23:15).

Here we observe the radical danger of confusing the voice of conscience with the voice of God. To say the matter differently, we would say our fear of guilt drives us to goodness, but we are neither good nor are we creative in our inter-personal relations because we are afraid of life.

3. *Justice.* Justice also may be linked to the demands of the negative conscience. Law is usually stated in the negative, telling us what we cannot do. This seems to be true because justice arises out of our need for social cooperation. The problem of justice is the exclusion of arbitrariness, so law seeks to define what cannot be done.[8] The sense of injustice is stronger than the sense of justice because injustice is rooted in our negative conscience. That is, conscience is formed out of the necessity for social order in the face of individual desires. Order becomes the good of the state, motivated in some measure by non-rational fear of dis-

[7] Henry Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, Vol. I, Sheed & Ward, London, 1958, p. 25.

[8] Morris Ginsberg, *On the Diversity of Morals*, Heinemann Ltd., London, 1956, p. 112.

order. Order is in this sense not a principle about which positive justice can be motivated, but rather a regulatory mechanism that prevents anarchy. This type of social order is restrictive and allows for possibilities but does not define them.

A practical way to appraise this point is to recall how difficult it is to obtain public support for programs that seek to define justice or to create conditions for maximum utilization of natural and human resources. Public support can far more quickly be mobilized about legislation that prevents injustice, such as stiff penalties for the illegal selling of narcotics. Injustice, like conscience, is clear about prohibitions, unclear and weak about affirmations.

The line of thought thus far can be summarized as follows. Because conscience develops out of prohibitions and derives its content from society, we realize that we cannot use it as the proof of God, the voice of God, nor the basis of a practical ethic. Faith, goodness and justice, insofar as they are the out-working of negative conscience, are sub-Christian in their substance.

II

The Christian Education of Conscience

A. *Conscience and the Bible*

What then would be a Christian view of conscience? Perhaps it is expecting too much to answer a question like that, but we might explore the possibilities of a peculiarly Christian conception of conscience.

We are at once struck with the fact that conscience is not a Biblical word. It is not used in the Old Testament and its main usage in the New Testament is by the Apostle Paul. The term is forced on Paul by the Greeks in the Corinthian Church. The Greeks were accustomed to testing their actions by their conscience; so, when the new Greek Christians faced the problem of eating meat that had been offered to idols, they naturally worried about their guilty conscience. In fact, Pierce has rather conclusively demonstrated that conscience is a Greek term coming out of the common life of the Greeks and that its common usage always meant guilty conscience.[9] That is, the conscience, when felt, was the negative conscience warning about an infraction of rules. Probably for this reason, Hyslop, writing in the Hastings Encyclopedia could say that, "the morality of antiquity, insofar as it was a subject of reflection, hardly got beyond the conception of prudence."[10]

If this is true, then Paul's wrestling with conscience is even more remarkable. Paul showed his native instinct for good instructional methodology by his alertness to the Greek temperament, for he advised that one should eat the host's meal and ask no questions for conscience's sake. However, if the fact was revealed during the meal that the meat had been offered to idols, then for conscience's sake (and Paul indicated your neighbor's conscience, not yours) it should be refused. (I Corinthians 10: 25-30). This is not a compromise for Paul stated clearly that an idol was nothing and the meat offered to idols could be eaten by Christians. However, since a Christian has a higher responsi-

[9] C. A. Pierce, *Conscience in the New Testament*, Allenson, Chicago, 1955.

[10] J. H. Hyslop, "Conscience," *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Hastings), Vol. 4, p. 31.

bility to his neighbor than he does to the items on the dinner menu, he should for his neighbor's conscience's sake, abstain from eating meat.

But Paul does not rest his case there. He seems to be embarrassed that the Corinthians raised the question because it cannot be decided on the basis of rules or law. To do so was to slip back into the error of Judaism. Paul realized that the conscience has a practical function only in terms of order and that the Christian must go beyond law to grace. Conscience, therefore, has a minor place in Paul's writings, for conscience was of the "old" man; and, since Christ died for sins, He should free us from our conscience and from asking ethical questions within the framework of a law conscience. Certainly Paul's life demonstrated that viewpoint. The old Saul was the servant of his negative conscience acting cruelly against Christians and persecuting them to death. The new Paul could write the 13th chapter of I Corinthians (note it was to the Greeks in Corinth) in order to show them a more excellent way. Thus, Paul's writings abound in phrases like "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ" (I Corinthians 11:1). "Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus" (Philippians 2:5). "I press on toward the goal for the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus" (Philippians 3:14). Paul becomes Christ-intoxicated because Christ saved him from his old self.

B. *Christ and Conscience*

Is not Paul's experience a help in understanding the Christian conscience? The love of God demonstrated in Christ releases us from the bondage of restrictive law and sets our feet on the path of service to the kingdom. The Holy Spirit relates us to Christ, invigorates us to seek the mind of Christ.

This theological affirmation seems to harmonize with much of our knowledge of conscience. Up to this point we have been referring almost entirely to the restrictive and largely unconscious conscience. But that is not the whole story. The growing child also internalizes portions of the positive code of behavior with which he is surrounded. This part of his being has been called the ego-ideal or the positive conscience. These are the things he accepts—this is the "should" that he really wants and is willing to pursue with cheerfulness and rationality. In fact, this portion of his personality is mainly conscious and far more readily accessible to the ego. Perhaps for this reason, or because it is formed last, it is weaker than the negative conscience. But the content of the positive conscience is also social and in that sense it also has its limitations in the Christian life. However, since the positive conscience is rather open to the ego, or the conscious self, we who are concerned primarily with the communication of the Christian faith may find that here is the area of personality to which we seek to relate the Christ. If this is so, then it means that we see the Christian faith coming into a person as a new element relating a person to Christ by faith, a Christ who has historical validity and yet one who is simultaneous with one's self.

Now, let's go back and pick up the concept of shame which we left earlier. Conceptually—this may not be so clear clinically—conceptually, we might think of shame as a result of violating our positive conscience; that is, as a result of not having done what we really know

we ought to do. This is different from the feeling of hostility and guilt resulting from not doing what we think we *must* do. The latter is the tyranny of the "should." Thus, important distinctions emerge. Guilt is concerned with specific acts against clearly understood regulations and its healing usually leads a person to delete wrong acts or compensate for guilt by one of the psychological mechanisms such as projection or self-punishment. The result is the establishment of equilibrium but not necessarily any forward progress, insight or growth. But shame results from failure to live up to what one has voluntarily accepted and causes a person to be concerned with himself. It causes him to think of why he did not do what he should have done and often leads to insight into his own nature. His mind works through the quality of his experience and moves voluntarily to change his self-image and his relations with others. In this sense, shame causes us to face our deepest self and in a moment of self-revelation it opens up a person's perception of his own possibilities. Real shame does not immediately prompt action so much as it makes for reflective thought that re-orients and re-educates the self. In short, shame brings about transformation.

Perhaps for this reason we are not surprised to find that shame is a Biblical word. The concordance shows a long list of usage in both Testaments. Although the word is used in a variety of ways, the general idea in the Old Testament is that shame results when a person betrays God's trust. The worst shame, therefore, is idolatry (Jeremiah 2:26) for this is the ultimate betrayal of God. Contrariwise, the promise is made by the Psalmist that "none that wait for thee be put to shame" (Psalms 25:3).

The New Testament seems to carry the same general usage but probably goes further in relating shame more directly with glory. For example, in the fifth chapter of Acts, we find the apostles in prison because of their vigorous preaching and healing. They are brought before the Council and it appears that they will be killed when Gamaliel intervenes with his wise and moderate words. The Council thereupon calls the apostles in and has them beaten and orders them not to speak in the name of Jesus. The account reads (Acts 5:41) "then they left the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor (or shame) for the name." The lack of a sense of shame is characteristic of the enemies of Christ. Paul says of them (Philippians 3:19) "Their end is destruction, their God is their belly and they glory in their shame with minds set on earthly things."

The phrase "Be not ashamed of Christ" or its equivalent is used by several New Testament writers (Mark 8:28, Luke 9:26, I John 2:28). In each case, the writer warns that one should not separate himself from Christ which is a reverse way of saying that our glory is in relationship to Christ. The modern miracle is God's gift of himself in Christ to the believer. Our task is to help a person grow in grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ so that he may pass through the confines of his negative conscience and emerge as one whose only fear is the shame that might come to an unworthy disciple.

C. *Church and Ethics*

Although that last statement may

clarify our intention in the Christian education of conscience, it certainly does not give us all the help we need. Our major problem is an adequate view of the nature of the Church. The Roman Catholic position has already been stated, that the Church forms the content of, and legislates for, the believer's conscience. Our Protestant position is not only unclear; our commonly held view of conscience makes it difficult to develop an adequate conception of the Church.

Perhaps this is because of our origin. The Reformation was, among other things, an impulse in the mind and conscience of individuals seeking to find and worship God. This, of course, put them in conflict with powers in the state and church, but the liberty of conscience they sought was liberty to worship and serve God. The priesthood of believers was a doctrine that brought responsibility for the spiritual health of the congregation back into the hands of the laity. These affirmations were all caught up in a social and political situation that caused all of the continental reformers to hold that rebellion or at least civil disobedience was proper for the Christian under some circumstances. There was no uncertainty in the mind of a second generation reformer like Knox that rebellion was good and proper for Scotland.

But what does Protestantism mean today? The doctrine of liberty of conscience, forged in the heat of intense strife against tyranny, has come to mean individualism. Actually, many modern men who want to be free just want to be loose. The priesthood of believers has become for many license to believe and do as they please. The image of the reformer as rebel has been steadily held before our people so that about all some Protestants know about the Reformation is the "Here I stand" of Martin Luther. All of this is wrapped up in a bundle called conscience and it has become a stumbling block to an understanding of the Church.

It is a stumbling block because the average layman has become convinced that his conscience is not only the best guide, but also is the only orthodox Protestant norm of behavior. If confronted with Gospel demands that question cultural norms, many of our Protestant laymen instinctively assume what they consider to be the Martin Luther stance and become the sole authority for everything. Such extreme individualism is undoubtedly compounded out of the achievement-success social value that dominates contemporary American life.

Note what happened when a group of New Orleans Roman Catholic laymen recently asked the Pope to overrule their bishop on the integration of their parochial schools. The reply came back quickly in favor of integration and affirmed the Roman Catholic policy of the right of the Church to decide moral issues.

Now note the Protestant dilemma. At the national level, we have had many proclamations against segregation and practically every group has based its claim on the right of the Supreme Court to set the law of the land. "Obey the law" is about all we've said in many of these resolutions. We will live to regret these declarations that use the Supreme Court and its authority as the norm for ethical decisions.

For if the Supreme Court continues the line of interpretation laid down in

the case Macintosh *vs.* United States, it will rule that when conscience comes into conflict with the state, the Supreme Court will determine the content of conscience. Justice Sutherland, writing for the majority in that case said of Professor Macintosh, "When he speaks of putting his allegiance to the Will of God above his allegiance to the government, it is evident, in the light of his entire statement that he means to make his own interpretation of the Will of God the decisive test which shall conclude the government and stay its hand." Justice Sutherland then went on to say that as a nation we must "go forward upon the assumption, and safely can proceed upon no other, that unqualified allegiance to the nation and submission and obedience to the laws of the land, as well those made for war as those made for peace, are not inconsistent with the Will of God."[11] Can the Supreme Court do anything else with conscience other than identify it with the best interests of the nation?

We cannot accept the Roman Catholic view for that absolutizes the Church and the Church hierarchy, giving men more moral power than history proves they can handle. What can we say about conscience and the Church as it relates to ethical action? Three possibilities come to mind.

First, we must not justify our position on ethical questions by resorting to secular authority or power. To do so secularizes faith and undermines the moral power of the Church. It puts the Church in the position of being a broker in moral ideas always trying to help its clients get the most out of the market under varying conditions. It confuses the believer as to the source of enlightenment for his conscience. Rather, we see the secular authority as a necessity for order and law as a rational means of providing for justice.

Second, we must not use conscience as a basis of ethical decisions. Conscience is too culturally orientated to provide a reliable guide and too individualistic to reflect the New Testament conception of the Church as the Body of Christ. In fact, if we let conscience be our guide we are no further along than the newly converted Greeks in the Corinthian church. This is not to say that we will try to live without conscience. Rather, the Christian personality will be developed with a negative conscience as anyone else but with a content that is informed by the most enlightened standards.

Third, while upholding the right of the individual to judge ethical questions, we must also affirm the necessity of the Church's developing the content of conscience for social and ethical questions. This moral norming process is very important in shaping a contemporary 'ought' for Protestants because so many pressing social problems and opportunities do not have clear Biblical nor historical parallels on which judgment can rest. From an educational point of view, we have enormous problems here because we are dealing with so many unstable and variable elements. While upholding the rights of the individual, we must look to the welfare of the whole; while shaping the ideal solution, we cannot forget the realistic dimensions of the situation. Yet, there is a process by which the conscience can be sensitized by the Holy Spirit, and the Church is the place

[11] 283 U.S. 605-635 Macintosh *vs.* United States.

designed for that process to occur. Perhaps we should be giving more energy to a deliberate study of how the Church in a community or as a denomination can effectively learn the mind of Christ. Otherwise, we may be open to the comment of an English clergyman who characterized the Protestant movement as "the history of enthusiasm."

D. *Church and the Devotional Life*

Along with the role of the Church in shaping the content of conscience is the necessity of the Church's communicating to believers the figure of Christ with clarity and conviction. Although all phases of the Church's life contribute to this purpose, the devotional life is most applicable. Here a person, through public worship, private meditation, sermon, and study, finds a blend of reason with sentiment that constructs and reconstructs the image of the living Christ.

Times change, the content of conscience adjusts, but the object of worship abides. It is our Christian affirmation that God was in Christ Jesus reconciling the world to himself and that the figure of Christ can transcend time to speak to us in our present situation. Here within the devotional life of the Church we have the means of fixing our aspirations on the person of Christ, his life, teachings, death, and resurrection. Without losing individuality, adults can find their highest joy in the work and worship of the Church. Adolescents can move away from the authority of the family and find the concerns of God within the household of God. Children can share the faith of the Church and learn the meaning of symbols and stories by which the church has lived. Together, God's people live toward the future and in the devotional life of the Church we use our imagination to relate ourselves to the image of Christ so that an authentic word of direction and meaning will capture our heart.

PREPARED TO BE

James G. Emerson

Mark 10:21 "Go, sell what you have . . . come, follow me."

After listening to the discussion this weekend, I feel led to ask this question: Is religion real?

In asking it, my mind goes back several years to a storybook wedding that took place in our church. A beautiful girl and an equally handsome man came to get married. The girl had grown up in the Church School and gone to a Christian college. Her fiancé had a perceptive faith. Both had always done what society would say was "right." In other words, these were "good people."

As an air force pilot, a year after the marriage and a month after their first child, Bill was killed in a crash. Why? Because the man who was supposed to take the flight was off with a camp follower and drunk. In the parlance of a Western, the "good guy" did not win.

Is it any wonder that when Bill's wife came back for the funeral her first question to me was, "Jim, is religion real, or are we just fooling ourselves?"

This girl is the counterpart of the rich young ruler in Scripture who also had done everything right from his youth. When he sensed that he still did not have a hold on life—eternal life to be exact—Jesus told him, "Go, sell what you have . . . . come, follow me." In this statement, I submit that Jesus was saying to him, to the young girl in the church, and to us that the truth or falsity of religion is not our problem. Rather, he was saying that our problem is simply to be what we really are.

I

Let me show you what I mean:

In this statement, Jesus turned on its head the popular idea of religion. Religion is thought of as something we do in order to get life. Jesus says that it is the reverse. "Get life, and that will tell you what to do with your religion."

Consider how religious this young man was. He is the type of person we desperately try to get in our churches. He tithed! That would help meet the church budget and let us make a contribution to the seminary too—we like that! He did not run off with the deacon's wife. He did not murder the organist. He was a good boy. Thus, when Jesus first pointed to the commands, "Do not murder, do not steal, do not commit adultery," the man protested, "But all these things I have done from my youth."

That is the trouble. Religion constricts us. Religion tries to blueprint every part of life even from youth. Cry too much at a funeral and it says you have no faith; cry too little and it says you must not have cared.

To the girl in the church and to the rich young ruler, the answer must be, "No. Religion is not real. Your problem is to be what you really are, namely one who has hold of life; and religion will not help you."

But Christ—the Incarnation of life—is real. Consider the contrast of the ruler with a dying woman I met several

years ago. She used to be a popular dancer with Fred Astaire. She had no church and no faith. She said, "I do not know how to explain it, I do not even know how to ask the question, but can't you help me find something before I die?" I met many weeks with her. The last time I saw her, I was reading John 14. At the phrase, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," she began to sob. "All my life I've sought this," she said, "and now that I've found it, it's too late." There was a long pause; then she turned and said, "but I have found it."

Her problem was to be what she was and when she found, she was fulfilled. Your culture, your religion, your intellect will not help you find it. Rather, when you have found it, life will tell you what to think of religion. That is why Jesus said, go, sell, and come, follow that which is the incarnation of life itself.

II

What I mean is not expressed only by what Jesus says about religion. What I mean is also clarified by what Jesus says concerning thoughts about him. It is not, as popularly thought, belief in Jesus that counts. "Why talk to me; why callest thou me good?" he said to the ruler.

It is obedience to Jesus regardless of what you believe that counts. This does not sound right, does it? We say, "Explain to me the divinity of Christ, the forgiveness of sin, and the way predestination and free will can go together, and then I will believe."

However, if there is one thing that we should all have learned from psychoanalysis, it is that life does not work that way. It was the discovery of Sigmund Freud that each of us has hidden commitments that determine the way we believe. It is the insight of Erich Fromm and others that without an organizing base from which to start—without a frame of orientation—life as a fulfilling personal experience is not possible. Our task is to look at the possible bases and find the one that leads to life.

In the conversation that Dr. McCord reported between Joseph Hromadka and the Communist leader, the final statement was "time will tell (which person was right)." This is true, but the individual does not have to wait, indeed cannot wait for society or history to render its verdict. The discovery can happen in the individual's life. The individual can make the discovery which will enable him to shape the history that will prove Dr. Hromadka to be right; the individual does not have to be shaped by history.

Therefore, remember that the Doctrine of the Trinity, and all other doctrines, grow as attempts to express the way people experience obedience to God in Jesus Christ; not the reverse.

Go! Sell what you have. Get rid of the rich load of prejudice, of sophomoric assurance that you are rich with answers. And come; try to do the thing you think Jesus would have you do.

Be prepared to *be*. Be prepared to be what you really are. Do this, and with the disciples in our text, you will find brothers, fathers, sister, LIFE a hundred fold.

III

One last meaning must be seen here.

Simply because our Lord reverses the popular view of religion and of a

Messiah, he also reverses the popular view of one's mission in life.

Most people think of a job as something you do to earn a living. In the context of our Scripture, however, you cannot separate the promise of heaven and the command of action. Jesus is as much as saying that one's job is an expression of the living he has already won. It expresses your relation to the God or god you have chosen to follow. If money is that god, your job will express it in one way. But if the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the God of our Lord Jesus Christ is your God, then you will express it another way. One's mission in life and one's being Christian are two sides of that same coin.

In the Old Testament reading, David went into battle because the battle was the Lord's and so was David. Paul became a missionary because that was part of his being Christian; he could not do anything else.

I get very tired hearing the sentimental drivel about the sacrifice people make to go into the professional ministry. For one thing, much of it is not true. Compare the salaries of teachers and ministers, for example. The point is that a clergyman is a clergyman because this is the most meaningful and exciting way he can be himself. Luther did not sacrifice himself at the Diet of Worms. He said, "Here I stand, I *can do no other*." He could do no other and still be what he was.

Because of this point, I do not regret that fewer people are in seminary today than last year. That will force us to take seriously the ministry of the Church—not just of the clergyman. And I resist the temptation to tell you the true and exciting reasons why you should come to seminary. I do this because I define a Christian as one who is prepared to be chosen, and a minister as one who has answered a call to be chosen to a particular task. The clergyman's task is but one. Rather, I urge you to sell the ideas you have about your life and to take no job except one that is taken because you believe God wants you to take it.

This means that your task in college is to learn how to know what you are supposed to be. In your science, philosophy, home economics, and other courses, you are preparing yourselves to be chosen.

Take this seriously. Last year, my mother met a carpenter in Communist Yugoslavia. When he saw a picture of me in the pulpit, he said, "Give him this message for me: Ten years ago, that was my picture. Now, they have taken away my congregation, my church, my pulpit. Now they would take away my soul." "Tell your son," he cried, "to lose everything else, but to protect the freedom of his pulpit." "Tell your people to lose all else, but to protect the freedom of their souls."

Free your souls.

"Go, sell what you have," said our Lord, "then come, follow me. . ."—as ones prepared to be what you really are; as ones prepared to be chosen.

THE LOVE OF GOD

JOHN H. MARKS

Hosea 11:1 "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and called him out of Egypt to be my son." (Trans. G. A. Smith)

SOMEONE has summed up the unlikeliness of the Old Testament story with the familiar words: "How odd of God to choose the Jews." It is strange, isn't it, that Hebrew writers like Hosea could declare God's love for Israel. An insignificant, despised nation, with no claim to great power or cultural achievement, existing briefly as a nation in the short period between the fall of one empire and the rise of another—this people asserted God's love for them! Even if one admits that such claims were common practice in those days, admits that Israel was only following accepted custom, the declaration remains astonishing. What possible evidence did the Hebrews have of divine love? Compared with the Egyptians, the Assyrians, or the Phoenicians, they had no proof of their god's favor. They were poor, politically divided, with a history of enslavement. Whence this notion about God's love?

But Hosea's assertion becomes even stranger when it is supported by a declaration of God's call from Egypt. The prophet in this affirmation explicitly rejects the usual proofs of God's love, the proofs of superiority, success, security, and finds God's love manifested in just this rejection. God loved Israel and revealed his love in calling his people out of Egypt. Even Israel found this logic absurd and longed to return from the rigors of life in a promised land to the cultural joys of Egypt. Israel never could quite throw off the Egyptian yoke, as her prophets never tired of reminding her. Egypt was always in the background of her thought as the symbol for what God should have done for Israel if he were really God.

The great insight of Hosea's declaration lies in its apparent absurdity. Proof of God's love, he asserts, is not found in mighty empires, in great cultural or military achievement, but rather in the call from Egypt. God's love is revealed in a decisive act of deliverance; it can be apprehended in the deliverance from Egypt. The prophet did not think of that redemption simply as an escape or a self-interested proof of divine favor. Hosea and the other Hebrew prophets never conceived of God simply as the benefactor of Israel's desires for success. Rather, Hosea spoke of the deliverance from Egypt in terms of a summons: "When Israel was a child, I loved him and from Egypt I called him to be my son." God's love could be known in obedience to the call from Egypt, the call from slavery to sonship. If a man wanted to know love, urged Hosea, let him consider what the exodus from Egypt to the Promised Land really meant.

An awareness of this call from Egypt constituted both the glory and tragedy of Israel's history, and in a wider sense it is the glory and tragedy of human

history. God's love, as prophets know, is an ethical demand to be obeyed in a promised land in faith and freedom. God's love is the call to be God's son. God's love is the opportunity for a man to find himself and learn that he is accepted just as he is by the God who calls him. God's love is God's call out of Egypt. This is the glory of Israel's faith and our religious heritage. But the tragedy is that we, like Israel, do not take the call seriously. We are unable to believe that divine love is really a call from Egypt. We want other conditions; we demand to know love amid the comforts of Egypt without the rigors of Canaan, in the actual without the promise. We prefer merit to faith, sight to hope because we understand them better. Ultimately we prefer the system and slavery to adventure and freedom and thus turn our backs on love.

Egypt represented at least two things to Israel. It represented first of all bondage, enslavement, the inability of the people to be itself, the necessity by force of custom and authority for being and doing what it really was not. In Christian theology Egypt became the symbol for bondage to sin. The bondage of sin is a way of saying that a man is not free to be human, that he cannot be himself because he cannot accept himself as he is, that he cannot accept the fact that his work never turns out completely as he hoped in spite of his best efforts. Israel recognized God's love as his summons to freedom from this kind of slavery. Only when a man is delivered from this enslavement can he really be a man, can he really accept his own peculiar creaturely nature, can he trust God to accept his work. God's call constituted Israel as a nation, a new people in freedom, set en route through the desert of anxiety to a promised land of fulfillment.

But for Israel Egypt also represented civilization, culture, superiority. It represented the spiritual benefits of a culture thousands of years old, the heritage of generations of progress and advance. And God's call, God's love, was a summons to Israel to turn its back on all this and depart into the hills of Palestine. One who has never travelled between Egypt and Palestine cannot fully appreciate the enormous difference between the two lands. The luxuriant green belt of the Nile valley gives unity, strength and peace to the desert. It provides an unceasing water of life to an otherwise parched and desolate land. The stony Palestinian hills, on the other hand, rising high above the humid and oppressive heat of Egypt, are completely dependent on the rain for their life-giving power. Life in the Promised Land is more frugal, more precarious, and as a result faith is critical and hope is earnest. Palestine too has a peaceful landscape, but it is the peace of horizons and of hope.

Israel, therefore, apprehended God's love as a call out of civilization. The prophet said in effect that being God's son is not dependent upon culture or learning, not dependent upon power or prestige. Being God's son means being humble, turning one's back on the idols of success and security, being willing to set out in faith from the slavery of a status quo to a land of promise where life can be fulfilled.

The Promised Land, to be sure, did not free the Hebrews from the necessity of coming to terms with the problems of culture. They had to form a state and confront political and social and cultural difficulties like those they

had left in Egypt. What their experience should have taught them, however, was that freedom and life do not consist in the abundance of things with which a man surrounds himself, but rather in a man's awareness and acceptance of God's mercy. Hosea was concerned that his people not mistake civilization for an ultimate divine revelation, for an ultimate value. Civilization, he reminds them, can be slavery; culture can become a substitute for faith; religion can be solely a cultural form without the content of valid experience. But God in mercy would set Israel free from this; God had called her from Egypt.

The central fact of God's love is the call to leave Egypt and be God's son. But the sad fact of human experience is our inability to accept the call. Hosea gives with pathos the judgment on Israel's history. "The more I called them," he reports, "the more they went from me; they kept sacrificing to the Baals and burning incense to idols." Israel did leave the land of Egypt to be sure, but her life in Canaan was one long story of trying to remake the promised land in the image of Egypt, a major world power, restricted to Hebrews. And has not the Christian Church re-enacted Israel's history? Has it not turned the promised land of the Gospel of God's love into a civilized, solidified, self-satisfied Egypt? What a thriving, exclusive organization the Church is! All of us sacrificing to the Baals of our time and burning incense to idols!

The fearful truth about human life is that we know about a promised land of freedom and we do set out from the slavery of Egypt, but again and again we find ourselves unable to accept the freedom of love, the freedom to be ourselves because God in mercy has made us as we are. We seldom realize that only God's love makes us human, that life is a gift, that slavery is only the result of our unwillingness to accept it as a gift, and that to accept it as a gift is to love God. The Baals and idols are everywhere, always demanding their share of our life. And we give to them because we feel we must earn what we are, because this satisfies our pride. But when Israel was a child God loved him, not paid him, not rewarded him, not preferred him—God loved him and called him out of Egypt from being a slave to become a son.

George Adam Smith, the well-known Scottish expositor, illustrated what a realization of God's love may mean for life in a moving description. "A man," he wrote, "has a mystic power of a very wonderful kind upon the animals over whom he is placed. On any of these wintry roads of ours we may see it, when a kind carter gets down at a hill, and, throwing the reins on his beast's back, will come to its head and touch it with his bare hands, and speak to it as if it were his fellow; till the deep eyes fill with light, and out of these things so much weaker than itself, a touch, a glance, a word, there will come to it new strength to pull the stranded wagon onward. The man is as a god to the beast, coming down to help it, and it almost makes the beast human that he does so."

This was God's history with Israel, exclaimed Hosea. "It was I who taught Ephraim to walk, I took them up in my arms; but they did not know that I healed them. I led them with cords of compassion, with the bands of love, and I became to them as one who eases the

yoke on their jaws, and I bent down to them and fed them." But Israel did not know. And therefore the inevitable occurred. "They shall return to the land of Egypt, and Assyria shall be their king, because they have refused to return to me. The sword shall rage against their gates, and devour them in their fortresses. My people are bent on turning away from me; so they are appointed to the yoke, and none shall remove it." This is after all the either/or of life, either slavery or sonship. To reject God's love is to return to Egypt and bondage, to choose hell, the hell of guilt and frustration and lack of meaning.

John Salinger once described a soldier to whom world war had revealed the hell of such bondage. This is what he wrote:

When he let go of his head, X began to stare at the surface of the writing table, which was a catchall for at least two dozen unopened letters and at least five or six unopened packages, all addressed to him. He reached behind the debris and picked out a book that stood against the wall. It was a book by Goebbels, entitled *Zeit ohne Beispiel.* It belonged to the thirty-eight-year-old unmarried daughter of the family that, up to a few weeks earlier, had been living in the house. She had been a low official in the Nazi party, but high enough, by Army Regulations standards, to fall into an automatic arrest category. X himself had arrested her. Now for the third time since he had returned from the hospital that day, he opened the woman's book and read the brief inscription on the flyleaf. Written in ink, in German, in a small, hopelessly sincere hand writing, were the words "Dear God, life is hell." Nothing led up to or away from it. Alone on the page, and in the sickly stillness of the room, the words appeared to have the stature of an uncontestable, even classic indictment. X stared at the page for several minutes, trying, against heavy odds, not to be taken in. Then, with far more zeal than he had done anything in weeks, he picked up a pencil stub and wrote down under the inscription, in English, "Fathers and teachers, I ponder 'What is hell?' I maintain that it is the suffering of being unable to love." He started to write Dostoevski's name under the inscription, but saw—with fright that ran through his whole body—that what he had written was almost entirely illegible. He shut the book.

There is no satisfactory, rational answer, no legible answer to life's problems. But Hosea and the prophets could not believe that human recalcitrance and evil were life's final end. They could not believe that bondage was man's chief end. They did not despair of life. God's love would be meaningless if it could be thwarted, if man's unwillingness or inability to accept it were ultimately the victor. This is after all the truth of the cross, that love never fails, that God does not stop loving just because men can not stop hating, that we are accepted in spite of everything. In the catastrophe of Calvary God's love and man's inability to love stand forever revealed, and from the Cross were spoken the words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Hosea said the same thing with unshakeable conviction: "How can I give you up, O Ephraim! How can I hand you over, O Israel! How can I make you like Admah! How can I treat you like Zeboiim! My

heart recoils within me, my compassion grows warm and tender. I will not execute my fierce anger, I will not again destroy Ephraim; for I am God and not man, the Holy One in your midst, and I will not come to destroy." Israel had chosen slavery, preferred it to sonship; but God would not turn his back on Israel, even in her deserved affliction. The inevitable consequence of rejecting love is hell, but even in the midst of hell God still loves; he does not destroy.

The profound insight of our religious heritage is that God is love. This insight has been revealed in the history of a people who dared in the midst of catastrophic contradictions to declare that God had chosen them, loved them, called them from Egypt to be his children. This love has been revealed in the life of a Palestinian peasant who dared to believe he was God's son, and in whose life and death men have experienced love and known God. This love is the decisive fact of human experience, and to accept it is the meaningful goal of human striving. Strip from life all its trappings, go to the heart of human heartache or joy, and at the center of it all will be the yearning to be loved and to love which speaks to the soul of reality. God is love, and to know this is life eternal.

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

Bruce M. Metzger

During the months which have elapsed since the date of its publication on March 14, the New Testament of the New English Bible[1] has been widely circulated. Its attractive blue covers with a chaste decoration in gold, as well as the magnificent typography so characteristic of the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses, are now familiar to most of the readers of *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*. Certain details of its production are well known, and therefore in the following account are either briefly alluded to or are omitted entirely.

History of the New Translation

In May 1946 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland received an overture from the Presbytery of Stirling and Dunblane recommending that a translation of the Bible be made in the language of the present day. The overture was drawn up and guided through the various stages of implementation by the Reverend George S. Hendry, then minister in the town of Bridge of Allen and now professor of theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. After several months of negotiating with representatives of other major Protestant denominations of Great Britain, as well as the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge, a Joint Committee was formed which entrusted the actual work of translation to four panels of scholars, dealing respectively with the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the New Testament, and the literary revision of the whole. (The Committee was well advised to create a literary panel to review the work of the translators, for the common criticism of the British Revised Version of the New Testament, published in 1881, was—to use the terse phrase of Spurgeon—"long on Greek, short on English.") It is expected that the Old Testament and the Apocrypha will be finished during the next decade. The publication this year of the New Testament coincides with the 350th year of the publication of the King James or so-called Authorized Version.

Since January 1948 the Joint Committee met twice a year, usually in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey. At these meetings it received reports on the progress of work from the chairmen of the four panels. From time to time the Committee met members of the panels in conference. The Chairman of the Committee was Dr. J. W. Hunkin, Bishop of Truro; after his death in 1950 he was succeeded by Dr. A. T. P. Williams, Bishop of Durham (and later of Winchester).

The convener of the panel of Old Testament scholars is Professor G. R. Driver of Oxford; the convener of the Apocrypha panel is Professor G. D. Kilpatrick, also of Oxford; and Dr. C. H. Dodd, Professor Emeritus of Cambridge, served as convener of the New Testament panel and continues to

[1] *The New English Bible: New Testament.* Oxford University Press; Cambridge University Press, 1961. Pp. xi + 447. $4.95.

be the general Director of the entire project.[2]

The procedure adopted for the work of the panels was as follows. Each book or group of books was assigned to an individual translator, who need not be a member of one of the panels.[3] The first draft of the translation was circulated in typescript to members of the appropriate panel, who worked through it individually and jointly in committee sessions along with the translator. When the draft had been thoroughly discussed and revised, perhaps several times, it went to the literary panel for suggestions as to improvement of English style. The final form of the version was reached by agreement between the two panels.

The New English Bible is a totally fresh translation; it is not a revision of earlier versions. The aim of the translators was to cut loose from all previous renderings and to "render the Greek, as we understood it, into the English of the present day, that is, into the natural vocabulary, constructions, and rhythms of contemporary speech. We have sought to avoid archaism, jargon, and all that is either stilted or slipshod" (Introduction, p. x). The new version, therefore, differs radically from widely circulated versions which stand in the lineage of the Tyndale and King James tradition. The R.S.V. Committee, for example, though sharing the aim "to avoid archaism, jargon, and all that is either stilted or slipshod," deliberately retained much of the time-honored phraseology of the King James version and ordinarily departed from it only when compelled to do so because of the acquisition of more accurate information regarding the Greek text or language. Other examples will be given later, but the point made here can be illustrated by comparing Matt. 25:26 in the three versions; the King James version reads, "Thou wicked and slothful servant," which the R.S.V. follows with, "You wicked and slothful servant!"—while the new British version uses the modern idiom, "You lazy rascal!"

The Recurring Need for Revisions

The recurring need for new translations of the Bible arises from several circumstances. The three which are most important relate to (a) advances made in lower (or textual) criticism of the New Testament manuscripts, (b) the acquisition of more precise information as to the meaning of Greek words and syntax, and (c) changes in the usage of the English language. The first is obviously the most basic of these three, for without textual criticism one does not know which variant reading deserves to be regarded as the original text. Briefly, it may be stated here that, in general, the panel has followed a type of text which approximates more or less closely to Westcott and Hort's edition of 1881. To be sure, here and there the translators, taking into account more recent manuscript discoveries, or assessing the evidence differ-

[2] The names of the members of the several panels are listed by F. C. Grant in his book, *Translating the Bible* (Greenwich, 1961), pp. 113-114. For further details as to the literary advisers, reference may be made to the article, "Dons gave Advice on New Bible," in *The Observer* (London), January 1, 1961.

[3] The identity of the initial translator of any given book (with but one exception) has been kept secret; only in the case of Mark's Gospel is the translator known, namely, the late Prof. T. W. Manson of Manchester.

ently from the judgment expressed by Westcott and Hort, have adopted a quite different variant reading from that which was chosen by the Revisers of 1881. Thus, in the account of Jesus cleansing the leper, they render Mark 1:41, "In warm indignation Jesus stretched out his hand . . ." rather than, "Moved with pity, he stretched out his hand and touched him" (R.S.V.), because they adopt the "Western" reading, ὀργισθείς, supported by Codex Bezae and part of the Old Latin evidence, instead of the more widely attested σπλαγχισθείς. Again, in Matt. 27:16 and 17 the translators have followed a variant reading (Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν instead of simply Βαραββᾶν) which is supported by the so-called Caesarean group of witnesses (Codex Koridethi, family 1, and Origen, along with the Sinaitic and Palestinian Syriac), and therefore in Matt. 27:17 they translate Pilate's question, "Which would you like me to release to you—Jesus Bar-Abbas, or Jesus called Messiah?" The reading ὑσσῷ ("javelin"), found in one minuscule manuscript of the eleventh century, is chosen for the text of John 19:29, and the reading ὑσσώπῳ ("hyssop" or "marjoram"), found in all other witnesses, is relegated to a footnote. These variant readings had been known to scholars for centuries, but heretofore no officially sponsored version had ventured to adopt them for the text. On the whole, however, the translators have exercized caution in text critical decisions, and the N.E.B. reflects no special tendency in this regard.

After the Greek text has been established in its purest form, the translator must make every effort to understand the meaning of its words and phrases. Here the Panel utilized the advances made by scholars during the past two generations. The discovery at the beginning of the twentieth century of many thousands of papyrus documents in the everyday Greek of the New Testament period has made possible a better appreciation of the finer shades of meaning of more than one Greek word or phrase in the New Testament. In general, the Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible join in differing from the Revised Version of 1881 and the American Standard Version of 1901 because both utilize this accumulation of lexicographical data. There are, to be sure, certain differences between the two versions, arising from a different estimate of the exact nuance of a given Greek word. Thus, the British translators decided to return to the older, classical meaning of κρύσταλλος and to render Rev. 4:6, "In front of [the throne] stretched what seemed a sea of glass, like a sheet of ice." On the other hand, a new interpretation of the meaning of συνχράομαι in John 4:9, which Prof. David Daube proposed in an article published in 1950,[4] has been incorporated into the text of the N.E.B. ("Jews and Samaritans, it should be noted, do not use vessels in common"), and the traditional rendering is placed in a footnote, "*Or*, Jews, it should be noted, are not on familiar terms with Samaritans."

It is chiefly in the third area mentioned above that the special characteristics of the new version are to be found, namely the set purpose to break with all previous translations and to

[4] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIX (1950), 137-148.

make a free translation into the English of today.

Sample Passages

Typical of the modern idiom adopted by the translators are the following examples chosen from three representative parts of the New Testament.

"Joseph went up to Judaea from the town of Nazareth in Galilee, to be registered at the city of David, called Bethlehem, because he was of the house of David by descent; and with him went Mary who was betrothed to him. She was pregnant, and while they were there the time came for her child to be born, and she gave birth to a son, her first-born. She wrapped him round, and laid him in a manger, because there was no room for them to lodge in the house" (Luke 2:4-7).

"Do not set your hearts on the godless world or anything in it. Anyone who loves the world is a stranger to the Father's love. Everything the world affords, all that panders to the appetites, or entices the eyes, all the glamour of its life, springs not from the Father but from the godless world. And that world is passing away with all its allurements, but he who does God's will stands for evermore" (I John 2:15-17).

"To the angel of the church at Laodicea write:

"These are the words of the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the prime source of all God's creation: I know all your ways; you are neither hot nor cold. How I wish you were either hot or cold! But because you are lukewarm, neither hot nor cold, I will spit you out of my mouth. You say, 'How rich I am! And how well I have done! I have everything I want in the world.' In fact, though you do not know it, you are the most pitiful wretch, poor, blind, and naked" (Rev. 3:14-17).

The accommodation to modern idiom is to be seen in such details as the altering of the sequence of items when the first person is involved. It will be remembered that Near Eastern custom gives priority to the first person (seen, for example, in what has come to be called the Mizpah benediction, "The Lord watch between *me* and thee. . . ."), whereas our contemporary usage prefers to put oneself last in a series. Accordingly, the new translation transfers the sequence of the Greek and previous English translations to read, "My father and I are one" (John 10:30). Similarly, instead of saying "[they] gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship" (Gal. 2:9), the new version renders the passage "[they] accepted Barnabas and myself as partners, and shook hands upon it"—the latter clause of which is a rather anachronistic expression to foist upon first century Near Easterners.

The translators of the new version have not hesitated to encroach upon the field of the commentator and to paraphrase the text when they believed that a literal rendering would be less satisfactory. Thus, in the passage from I John quoted above, twice the word κόσμος has been translated "godless world." The following are other examples of the insertion of words for which there is no express warrant in the text (for convenience of explanation the inserted words are italicized here; they are not italicized in the new version): "Those who sleep *in death*" (I Thess. 4:13); "in *the province* of Asia" (Rev. 1:4); "in his body of flesh *and blood*" (Col. 1:22); "*guard-*

ian angel" (Matt. 18:10; Acts 12:15); "*human* body" (Rom. 12:4); "his *life's* blood" (Rev. 1:5); "tongues of *ecstasy*" (I Cor. 13:8). In other cases the literal rendering is supplanted altogether by a periphrasis; thus "scribes" become "doctors of the law" (Mark 15:31, etc.), the parable of the talents is now the parable of the bags of gold (Matt. 25:14-30); the word traditionally translated "saints" is rendered "God's people" (Col. 1:2, etc.); "beloved" as a term of address becomes "dear friends" (I John 4:7, etc.); and the verb "it is written" (Rom. 12:19) becomes "there is a text which reads." Instances of this kind of paraphrase could be multiplied. It is doubtless because of such freedom in rendering the text that the principal reviewer of the New English Bible in *The* (London) *Times Literary Supplement* (March 24, 1961, p. 178) concluded his review with the words: "If one's sole concern is with what the New Testament writers mean, it [the new version] is excellent. It is otherwise if one wants to find out what the documents actually say."

The Titles of the New Testament Books

The typography of the table of contents of the volume strikingly suggests the four genres of literature contained in the New Testament. On that page the following are printed entirely in capital letters: The Gospel; Acts of the Apostles; Letters; The Revelation of John. Furthermore, just as in the Westcott and Hort's edition of the Greek New Testament, each of these four titles is repeated on a half-title page which precedes the section devoted to the book or books comprehended under that heading. Under the comprehensive rubric of "The Gospel" each of the four Gospels is listed as "According to Matthew," "According to Mark," etc. All this is to be commended as revealing still more clearly that there is one Gospel which found literary expression through the work of four Evangelists, and that the other portions of the New Testament fall into sharply delineated literary categories.

In the section containing "Letters" one finds the usual listing of Pauline and General, or Catholic, letters. At first sight one is inclined to praise the translators for giving to three of the letters the following titles: "A Letter to Hebrews," "A Letter of James," and "A Letter of Jude." Since we do not know whether, for example, James wrote more than one letter, it appears to be quite appropriate to designate the one which is included in the New Testament as "a" letter of James rather than "the" letter of James. On second thought, however, one begins to have reservations as to the legitimacy of such reasoning. Were the document standing alone, doubtless it would be correct to refer to it as "a" letter of James. But the fact is that in the corpus of documents now known as the canonical New Testament there is but one letter attributed to James. In the context, therefore, of an enumeration of the contents of the New Testament one should refer to it as "The Letter of James."

An Evaluation of the New Translation

How will the American reader react to this British translation? Will he regard it as an example of "timeless English," as Dr. Dodd somewhat grandly declared to be the aim of the Committee? How well has the Com-

mittee succeeded in avoiding "archaism, jargon, and all that is either stilted or slipshod" (p. x of the Introduction)?

It was to be expected that British spelling would be adopted, including "judgement," "honour," "centre," and the like. It is also understandable that reference should be made to British currency ("twenty pounds," Mark 6:37; "twopence," Luke 12:6; "the last farthing," Matt. 5:26—though the British government has recently abolished the farthing). And it is not altogether surprising to read "cornfields" where Americans would say "wheatfields" or "grainfields" (Mark 2:23 and parallels).

But what does one make of such expressions as putting one's lamp "under the meal-tub" (Matt. 5:15)? Do American farmers "clean" a "fruiting" branch (John 15:2) or "prune" it (R.S.V.)? A Britisher speaks of a "rising" (Mark 15:7), but an American of an "uprising" or "insurrection" (R.S.V.). How many on this side of the Atlantic know what a "midge" is (Matt. 23:24) or speak of "truckling to no man" (Matt. 22:16)? Other expressions which are less usual in America than in Britain are: "who put me in the dock" (I Cor. 9:3; compare Acts 26:6, "I stand in the dock today"); "trying to catch me out" (Matt. 22:18); "make do with your pay!" (Luke 3:14); "Whitsuntide" (I Cor. 16:8); "the people rounded on them" (Matt. 20:31); and "those who bore us company" (Acts 1:21)—if indeed the last is current in ordinary speech in Britain itself! Most Americans will find the expression, "God's people at Ephesus, believers incorporate in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 1:1; Phil. 1:1; etc.) a peculiarly stilted and unnatural expression. The sentence, "So they fell foul of him" (Mark 6:3), will not convey to Americans the meaning of the original, "They were scandalized by him." The usage of the phrase "on the stove" in the context of Matt. 6:30 will not be known to Americans (". . . how God clothes the grass in the fields, which is there today, and tomorrow is thrown on the stove. . . ."). The use of "tale" with the meaning of "sum total" ("the full tale of Christ's afflictions," Col. 1:24) has become archaic in America except in poetry. On the other hand, it is surprising to find in what is otherwise a sober and quite proper English translation more than one expression which verges on slang; for example, "could not hold their own" (Acts 6:10), "As Christ's own envoys we might have made our weight felt . . ." (Thess. 2:6), "You can take it from me that every man who . . ." (Gal. 5:3), "I never sponged upon you" (II Cor. 12:13), "They all left me in the lurch" (II Tim. 4:16), and the admonition in Jas. 5:9, "Do not blame your troubles on one another"—a construction labeled "slang or illiterate" in Fowler-Nicholson's *Dictionary of American-English Usage*.

Though the translators were instructed to make an entirely new translation, it is perhaps inevitable that here and there one can detect echoes of felicitous turns of expression borrowed from earlier versions. The striking phrase, he who "brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel" (II Tim. 1:10), comes straight from the K.J. and R.S.V. In Rom. 16:4 Prisca and Aquilla are said to have "risked their necks" to save Paul's life, just as in the R.S.V. There are other passages where, instead of striving to be differ-

ent, the British Committee would have been well advised to adopt a forceful earlier rendering. Thus, in I John 5:4, "The victory that defeats the world is our faith," strikes one as a distinctly weaker translation than the traditional ". . . that overcomes the world. . . ." And the crisp, though familiar, translation of Jesus' agraphon, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts 20:35), is supplanted by the inferior English: "Happiness lies more in giving than in receiving."

A certain unevenness of translation and, indeed, diversity of orientation can be observed in the several parts of the New Testament. For example, in Ephesians and Revelation ἐκκλησία is regularly translated by "church." In the other books it is translated 49 times by "congregation" and 21 times by "church." Likewise, a curious vacillation can be observed even within the same book regarding the presence or absence of capital letters. For example, one finds "Gospel" in Rom. 1:1, but in 1:2 it is spelled "gospel," as also in 1:9; but in 1:16 it is printed with an upper case initial letter. In Matthew "Bar-Abbas" appears four times, but in Mark, Luke, and John the word is spelled "Barabbas."

Finally, attention may be called to one or two blatant errors in the new version which have escaped the vigilance of the Committee. In most manuscripts Matt. 9:34 reads, "But the Pharisees said, 'He casts out devils by the prince of devils,'" but a few ancient witnesses omit the verse entirely. Misinterpreting the textual evidence, the British translators erroneously divide the sentence, putting part of it in the text ("He casts out devils by the prince of devils"), and part of it in a footnote (*"Some witnesses read* But the Pharisees said, 'He casts out devils. . . .'"). This is a blunder, for the manuscript evidence requires that the sentence be treated as a whole and placed either entirely in the text or entirely in a footnote. Another error appears at I John 2:13, which reads, "I write to you, fathers, because you know him who is and has been from the beginning," with a footnote attached to the last word, reading, *"Or* him whom we have known from the beginning." There is no justification for translating the Greek as is done in this alternative rendering.

Conclusion

Some readers who like J. B. Phillips' paraphrastic rendering and who have perhaps taken too literally certain claims made in the preliminary advertising regarding the "newness" of this version will be disappointed that The New English Bible is not more radical in its departure from previous versions. On the other hand, most readers who are accustomed to only the time-honored phraseology of the Tyndale and King James tradition, taken over in part by the Revised Standard Version, will feel that the new version just does not sound like the Word of God.[5] For modern pagans who have no knowledge of the Scriptures at all, this new render-

[5] This point of view was described by Robert Graves, Professor of Poetry at Oxford University, during the course of an address which he delivered at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Arts and Letters. "The verdict of the countryside" on the New English Bible, he said, is, "We don't like this book. The old one was holier. If I had to swear an oath on this book, I wouldn't feel bound to tell the truth" (*The New York Times,* May 25, 1961, p. 39).

ing may well be more intelligible and speak more directly to their understanding than versions in more archaic English. Many Church members, whether in Britain or America, will probably find that this new translation, freer and more paraphrastic than other standard versions, may be profitably used with those versions which stand in the classic tradition.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Presbyterian Way of Life, by John A. Mackay. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1960. Pp. 238. $3.50.

The fourth volume to be published in Prentice-Hall's "way of life" series, Dr. Mackay's *The Presbyterian Way of Life*, will be of great interest to the Princeton Seminary family, and of obvious value to the general public to which it is addressed. The first thing to be said is that this is an intensely personal book. To be acquainted with John Mackay in the flesh, to have heard him in action, is to recognize him in every turn of phrase of *The Presbyterian Way of Life*. The writer's friends have wondered if he would ever set down an account of some of the great events in the life of the Church which he has lived through and helped to shape. Until such an autobiography is forthcoming, the present volume offers a useful substitute, and rightly so. How else write about the Presbyterian way of life except as one has personally lived it?

One is reminded of the wide personal acquaintance with Presbyterianism the author has had: from the narrowest of Scottish Presbyterian sects, to the UPUSA with its ever broadening theological concern and outreach to the world. Yet this is no chauvinistically Presbyterian book. It is characteristic of the writer that by the third page of the prologue he is already speaking of what he has learned from others who were *not* Presbyterians: Saint John of the Cross, Saint Theresa of Avila, Luis de Leon, Miguel de Unamuno. Moreover the pages of this work are determined to take the world and its challenges into account. We hear of St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Ignatius Loyola, and Karl Marx. What have these men to do with Presbyterianism? They are examples of high "passion for truth" or "theological mindedness." John Calvin is only understood if he is seen in the arena with such men as these. Here is the intellectual level at which Presbyterians must enter the fateful debate about truth in the contemporary world, and the moral concern with which they must pursue it.

The book contains excellent short sketches of Presbyterian history which never fail to face the lamentable dark episodes squarely, and to put them in perspective. Likewise, we are given a series of characterizations of Presbyterian theology which are quick to acknowledge the inadequacies of some of the formulations of the past. Among values too numerous to mention, Dr. Mackay offers a very helpful treatment of the ordination vows which ministers of the UPUSA and other churches of the Reformed faith must take, showing the light in which they are today understood. The theological section in itself would make the book worthwhile to candidates for the ministry, to ordained ministers, and to church members interested in where Presbyterianism stands on issues of supreme importance.

With his customary realism, Dr. Mackay does not treat the contemporary Presbyterian scene as if all were one-dimensional agreement and harmony. He is aware of the multifarious tendencies within our denomination, describes them fairly, and offers his own viewpoint concerning a number of them. The following diverse quotations are illustrative: "Presbyterian ordination, whereby a man becomes 'a minister of the Word and Sacraments,' claims complete validity in the Church of Christ. For that reason, no Presbyterian Church will ever enter into organic union with any other church which disputes the validity of Presbyterian orders" (page 124). "While vestments, collars, bands, the Celtic cross, stained glass windows, more churchly architecture and the optional use of liturgy can, of course, become ends in themselves and substitutes for true Christian worship, which must always be 'in spirit and in truth,' nevertheless the spirit and direction of the present liturgical movement within Presbyterianism is wholesome. This is said by one who, both theologically and by temperament, has an intense dislike for mere ritual as such" (page 150). "Neither is the state merely a supreme principle of order which has no inherent right to introduce and enforce legislation regarded as being in the best interest of citizens as a whole, but whose enforcement would curtail some cherished advantages tra-

ditionally enjoyed by a small minority. This is a view held by some Presbyterian men of wealth. There is no doubt, however, that for Calvin, Knox, and the New England Puritans the welfare of all the people was the primary function of the state" (page 180). "Nothing whatever is gained by the kind of ecumenical bigotry which disdains and censures any manifestation of confessional enthusiasm or loyalty. Those who look down their 'ecumenical' noses at Christian brethren who, while believing that the Holy Spirit brought into being the Confession to which they belong, nevertheless subject their tradition to constant scrutiny in the light of the Bible, Christ, and their sister traditions, betray an ignorance of the ways of God and man" (page 223).

I would not hesitate to put this book, with its ecumenical spirit, sensitivity to history, and fairness in giving a rounded picture, in the hands of anyone desiring to know more of the meaning of Presbyterianism. Even for those who are already aware of most of the facts which Dr. Mackay presents, there remains the astonishing freshness of the diction of a master of English prose who, by the power of words, makes familiar things new. This is more than style. It is the writing of one who has truly lived the way of life he describes, far from blind to its faults and internal tensions, but loyal out of an abiding love for the brethren.

LEWIS S. MUDGE

World Alliance of Reformed Churches
Geneva, Switzerland

American Christianity: an Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents, vol. I, 1607-1820, by H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher. Charles Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1960. Pp. xviii + 615. $10.00.

It is a moot point whether history can be studied best by means of a narrative account written by a competent historian or by examining the documents on which a narrative account is based. The two views are roughly comparable to the ready-made *vs.* the do-it-yourself schools in household furnishings. There are advantages and pit-falls in each method. Most recently, however, an attempt is being made to combine both approaches within the confines of a single book. A good example of this approach is found in the volume under review. Three representative historians, Dr. Smith of Duke University, Dr. Handy of Union Theological Seminary in New York, and Dr. Loetscher of Princeton Theological Seminary have teamed up to produce a two-volume collection of significant documents in the field of American Christianity with an interpretive commentary introducing each document. The first volume (the second is expected off the press within a few months) covers the period from the Dutch settlement of Manhattan to the penetration of the Kentucky frontier by various churches after the War of 1812.

For anyone interested in the origin of our church traditions, this makes fascinating reading. There is the celebrated account of the martyrdom of the Jesuit missionary, Father Jogues. Jonas Michaelius tells of founding the first Dutch Reformed Church in New Amsterdam. There are delightful accounts of how the puritan divines of New England were goaded to fury by the nimble-witted attacks of women like Anne Hutchinson and Margaret Brewster. Francis Makemie gives a sturdy defense of his right to preach without a civil license in his trial before Lord Cornbury. In Charles Chauncy's attack on the revivalism of George Whitefield there are echoes of the same arguments which have been used against evangelists ever since, from Charles Finney to Billy Graham. The documents are usually brief, but they have been chosen with great care. Even though they cover a wide diversity of literary forms—diaries, letters, court cases, sermons, and church pronouncements, to name but a few—they have a dramatic quality about them which creates interest, even in a person of limited historical concern. There is something exciting about reading the defense in his own words of a man on trial for his life, or the moving confession of guilt made by Judge Sewall for his part in the Salem witchcraft trials. The high moments in our spiritual history come alive as we listen to the actual words of the men who created it.

There is something in this book for everyone. For those who prefer straight narra-

tion, there are the commentaries which stitch together the rather episodic documents. True, the commentaries are rather brief, but they are sufficiently comprehensive so that it is possible to get a fairly well-balanced picture of the evolving church life in America just from reading them alone. For most readers, however, the documents will prove sufficiently attractive so that they will create their own interest. An alternative approach is to read the documents first and then to see whether the surface impressions gained from that reading is confirmed by the editorial interpretations found in the commentary. Even the specialist will find something here to please him. The many footnotes and particularly the section entitled "Literature" at the end of each series of documents open up all sorts of avenues for further study. The extensive references to periodical literature as well as to the more standard works give eloquent testimony to the labor which went into the selection of the documents. The format of the book is excellent, and the typeset ideal for easy reading. Eight pages of illustrations have been inserted throughout the text, almost as an afterthought, and a brief but valuable Index rounds out the work (what would reviewers do without an index!).

The virtue of the book, its comprehensiveness, is also the basis of its principal weakness: it is too long for a text or for general reading. Students are apt to quail at the length if they do not quail first at the price. It seems to this reviewer that the best way to use the book is to browse through it rather than read it straight from cover to cover. As a matter of fact this can be very rewarding. Source books such as this can, in time, become not only treasured possessions but valued friends. Since the documents have already demonstrated that they can stand the test of time, the book which preserves and explains them should do so as well.

WALLACE N. JAMISON

The New Brunswick Theological Seminary
New Brunswick, N.J.

Dogmatics, by Hermann Diem. Translated by Harold Knight. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1961. Pp. 375. $6.95.

While the program of de-mythologizing the New Testament has given to Bultmann and his school wide publicity, theologians have begun to see now that the real challenge to Protestant faith comes from the existentialistic interpretation of the Gospel as proclaimed by the Form Critics and their followers. Characteristically, almost the whole second volume of Dr. Diem's *Dogmatik,* which forms the book under review, is devoted to this subject and the allied question of the role the historical Jesus occupies in the teaching of the Church. With Barth to whom the Tübingen professor owes more in his theology than to any other teacher, he shares the conviction that since Schleiermacher Protestant theology has been moving in the wrong direction, because it has almost completely lost contact with Biblical studies. But the sagacious critic also notices that Bultmann and his friends, Gögarten in particular, while apparently developing a Biblical theology, actually force the Bible to teach their preconceived ideas.

Some of Bultmann's pupils have come to realize the shortcomings of their master in this respect, but Diem points out that Kaesemann, Kuemmel, E. Fuchs, and Bornkamm are unable to appreciate the significance which the person of Jesus has for our faith, because they share their teacher's existentialistic interpretation. However, Barth, too is told that with his emphasis placed upon the Word he misses the real issue, viz., history. Symptomatic of the ecumenical situation is the fact that Diem pays considerable attention to Roman Catholic theology. Perhaps somewhat too one-sidedly he singles out Heinrich Schlier, a Protestant theologian recently converted to the Church of Rome, as a typical representative of the Catholic view.

Diem's own position is a combination of Scripture and dogma. Scripture as found in the canon bears witness to the facts no less than to the truth. Protestant theology, notwithstanding its critical approach to the Bible, must start from the self-evidencing authority of the Bible. However, Scripture and Church cannot be separated. Thus in order to discover the point of view from

which the text of Scripture is to be interpreted, the dogma representing the consensus of the Church is required. Although it is not to be understood—not even in its confessionalized shape—as a material truth but rather as a stimulus to research, the dogma is indispensable for the guidance of the exegete. In this way Diem hopes to keep dogmatics in flux and to avoid the stagnation of scholasticism, without falling into the trap of subjectivism.

Diem's work, including the untranslated first volume which deals with the role of the Church in theology, should enable Protestant systematic theology to rediscover its identity and should call it back from its self-abandonment in favor of religious philosophy. This reviewer holds, however, that Diem too fails to take history seriously enough notwithstanding his energetic plea for the historical Jesus. By substituting the *kerygma* for the Gospel story he is unable to expel the gnostic myth of the Bultmann school, and by disregarding the element of accumulation in the history of doctrine he isolates theology from the actual life of the Church. He also fails to differentiate between the *kerygma* as the revelation of the Incarnate Word, on the one hand, and dogma as the result of charismatic gnosis, on the other. Hence one wonders, how he will be able effectively to refute the Roman Catholic view of Tradition.

Otto A. Piper

The Theology of the Gospel According to Thomas, by Bertil Gärtner. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1961. Pp. 286. $5.00.

Neglected for some while, the newly discovered Coptic-gnostic documents of Nag Hamadi have given rise to a comprehensive literature in recent years. In many respects this work of the Swedish scholar stands out on account of its vast erudition, its clear presentation and its poised judgment. In the first half of the book, dealing with the literary character of the Gospel of Thomas, the author confronts it with other apocryphal literature of the age, a great deal of which belongs to the same find. He proves that this "gospel" is gnostic or gnosticizing in character. Its unique feature as a gospel—it consists exclusively of sayings ascribed to Jesus —is caused by the fact that in it Jesus is not proclaimed as a redeemer but rather introduced as a revealer. Attempts have been made by the school of Form Criticism to discover in this work an early source of the teachings of Jesus independent of Mark and Q. However, Dr. Gärtner proves convincingly that the numerous passages of the Gospel of Thomas, which have parallels in the Synoptic Gospels, are invariably borrowed from them. The secondary character of the Coptic work is evidenced by the slight yet clever changes by means of which the text is made to teach gnostic doctrines. In view of this fact there is but small hope that other passages which have no parallels in the canonical gospels present a genuine pre-Synoptic tradition. While the existence of *agrapha*, i.e., of sayings of Jesus not recorded in our Gospels should not be denied, any such sayings, if incorporated in this gnostic book, would be contaminated by tendentious revisions.

In several respects the second half of Dr. Gärtner's book, which deals with the theology of this "gospel," is his most important contribution. Whereas other scholars were satisfied in pointing out textual parallels from other apocryphal works, the Swedish scholar has made a real effort to bring to light the doctrines lying behind the parables, metaphors and enigmatic terminology of this strange book. The author concentrates mainly on the nature of man and his place in the universe, since it is upon this that the emphasis in Thomas's work is placed. Jesus appears merely as a revealer of the secrets of life, while narratives describing Jesus' ministry are completely absent. This fact is not to be interpreted as indicating a very early type of Gospel, but rather as a sign of gnostic manipulation of the gospel material. By thus bringing to light the theology taught in this "gospel," the author indirectly vindicates the ancient church's rejection of gnosticism. While its language seems to be that of the New Testament, the book teaches actually self-redemption by way of theological insights. A problem which from a historical viewpoint seems to be very important yet which the author has not treated, is the question, how far the gnosis taught in the Gospel of Thomas has its roots in pre-gnostic

ideas found in the writings of John, Paul, and the Revelation. The number of parallels which they present is certainly striking.

OTTO A. PIPER

Jesus of Nazareth, by Günther Bornkamm. English translation. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1961. Pp. 239. $4.00.

The school of Form Criticism, hard pressed by its critics for Bultmann's failure to assign to the Jesus of the Gospels a necessary place in the life of faith, has recently attempted in various ways to meet this criticism. One of these answers, and in many respects the least original one, is Professor Bornkamm's book, published in 1956 as a paperback in German. As might be expected, the basic axiom of Form Criticism, viz., that the tradition collected in the Gospels has been strongly influenced by the believing interpretation of the history and person of Jesus (p. 19) dominates this life of Jesus, too. The tradition's lack of historical concern, we are told, appears in its style of story telling (*ibid.*). The basic error of this method lies in its contention that the tradition found in the Gospels has its closest parallels in the formation of folk tales, and that a good deal of it is therefore the creation of the Church. Paul's references to the oral tradition show, however, that it was patterned after the manner of rabbinical teaching, where strict respect for the master's teaching was the supreme rule. While this fact does not exclude the influence which the popular style had upon that of the early Christian tradition, it precludes the free operation of pious imagination. What an insult to depict the apostolic generation as people who thought that by inventing a word or a deed ascribed to Jesus they could endow it with divine authority, truthfulness and effectiveness, for the mere fact that it had a bearing upon a certain situation in the life of the Church!

The Jesus who emerges from this treatment of the Gospels is not a man who acted in the awareness of his being the Son of God, and who therefore saw in his person and work the evidence that he occupied the central place in the establishment of God's Kingdom. Rather, we see in the Gospels "a movement of broken Messianic hopes, and one who was hoped to be the Messiah, but who not only at the moment of failure but in his entire message and ministry disappointed the hopes which were placed in him" (p. 172). The many Messianic passages found in the Gospels "should be regarded first of all as the Credo of the believers, and as the theology of the early church" (p. 173). Accordingly all the Messianic titles ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels are in all probability determined by the faith of the Church.

While Dr. Bornkamm does not deny the authority of Jesus, which was "the mystery of his personality and his influence," "the Gospels give us a right to discuss all this in a very human manner" (p. 61). Christianity, the author holds, is the result of the Easter message and the Easter faith (p. 183). Although the Easter message is said to be based upon appearances of the risen Christ, these experiences are obviously not coupled with the empty tomb but were rather interpreted as signifying that God had acknowledged Jesus and through him had given new life to those who had such experiences. For all practical purposes this portrait of the Jesus of history does not transcend the one that liberal theology displayed at the beginning of the century, and the method employed is the same, too. The scholar decides in advance what a man called Jesus is capable of doing, and he decrees that what Paul called *euangelion* was not God's good news but rather the product of the believing Church. No doubt many Protestants will be satisfied with such an interpretation of the Gospel story. The question only is whether life in this world acquires meaning merely because we believe that it has meaning, or whether we must say that all things have become new in this world when God sent his Son into it so that through his life and death and resurrection mankind might be given power to overcome the forces of evil.

OTTO A. PIPER

Luther's Works, ed. by Helmut T. Lehmann (Vol. 35: Word and Sacrament I, ed. by E. T. Bachmann). Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1960. Pp. xxi + 426. $5.00.

The editors of this new translation of Luther's Works have planned to devote four volumes to his writings on Word and Sacraments. Volume I, covering the period from 1519 to 1531, contains a number of relatively unknown treatises, some of them translated for the first time into English, plus the famous *Prefaces* to the Biblical books. Those to the Apocrypha had never appeared hitherto in an English translation. Also included is the rather well known *Open Letter on Translating* of 1530, in which Luther upholds his translation of the New Testament and particularly of Romans, over against the attacks of his Catholic opponents. Compared with Volume II of this section, which was published in 1959 and which contains the great writings on the Lord's Supper written between 1520 and 1526, this introductory volume provides little that is new or of extra interest. Other treatises dealing with Luther's views on the Sacraments are found in Vol. 40 (*Church and Ministry* II). E. T. Bachmann who translated or revised all the contributions to this volume has done an excellent job.

Otto A. Piper

Luther's Works, ed. by Helmut T. Lehmann and Jaroslav Pelikan. (Vol. 2: *Lectures on Genesis, Chapters 6-14*). Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1960. Pp. x + 433. $6.00.

The new English translation of Luther's Works makes steady progress through the united effort of the Concordia Publishing House and the Muhlenberg Press. The broad basis on which the project has been conceived seems to indicate that in the eyes of the editors this will be the definitive text upon which Anglo-Saxon scholarship will base its study of Luther. It is therefore regrettable that unlike the volumes published by Concordia, the Muhlenberg volumes lack the page by page references to the text of the Weimar edition.

The volume under review shows Luther's exegesis at its best. Where others would be tempted to dwell on the literary value or the historical significance of the stories told, Luther points to the operation of divine providence manifested in the events, and the striking examples of faith given by the Patriarchs. Equally remarkable is the sovereign way in which Luther refers to the human authorship of the Bible without thereby infringing upon its divine inspiration. Inspiration for him means that human media are no obstacles for God's communicating his truth to his people. Thus the text remains relevant notwithstanding the historical and cultural distance that separates the reader from it, and of which Luther takes due cognizance. Over against the many legends surrounding the stories, with which the Jewish interpreters tried to embellish their exegesis, followed therein by Lyra, the reformer confines his exposition to the text itself. Even when miracles are reported, he is more interested in the wisdom of God's ways expressed therein than in extolling the extraordinary character of the events. The translation by George W. Schick is both clear and eminently readable. Footnotes enable the reader to understand Luther's references to contemporary events and the literature used.

Otto A. Piper

God's Word into English, by Dewey M. Beegle. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1960. Pp. 178. $3.50.

Dr. Beegle, associate professor of Hebrew and Old Testament at the Biblical Seminary in New York, has written this book in order to indicate the essential translation features which enable a modern reader "to understand most clearly the truths intended by God's messengers in the Old and New Testaments" (p. ix). After answering generally the question why there should be revision (chapter 1), Beegle discusses the specific reasons in successive chapters on the Hebrew text, the Greek text, changes in the English language, changes in Hebrew and Greek lexicography, artistic style, the problem of alternative translations, and idiomatic equivalents. The book contains also five appendices which supply the prefaces to both Tyndale's translation and to the King James, the Dedication to King James I, a chronological table of English translations from Wyclif to the present, and a note on the translation of the name of God in the Old Testament. In addition there are scriptural and general indices.

The book is centered on the most recent English translations and uses the older ones to show that the King James was but one translation among many in its own age. Although the controversy in certain circles over the respective merits of the King James and the Revised Standard Version is obviously in the author's mind, and although he seems to address himself to a reader sceptical of translations since the King James, he does not engage in useless polemics but answers the problem in the best way by directing our attention to the necessary problems of all translations. His concern for the use of the Bible in the Church is apparent and he finds in the multiplicity of new translations a healthy sign for the witness of the Church. He shows concern for the private use of the Bible and its use in public worship and the ways in which translation affects these uses.

A large number of the more popularly known problems of the New Testament are discussed in detail, e.g., the Trinity passage in I John 5:7,8, the *pericope de adultera* in John 7:53-9:11, the doxology in the Lord's Prayer, and the endings of Mark. The printing of full examples makes the book readable and helpful and prevents the reader from wandering in a maze of references. The book does not deal exhaustively with all the problems of translating Hebrew and Greek. One wonders why more attention was not given to Ronald Knox's work. And some discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the popular modern translations would be helpful. There are dangers in them not apparent to the unwary reader; for example, the translation of Paul's term "flesh" as physical, physical nature, lower nature or natural desire may be quite misleading.

The author states he is writing primarily for layman, for whom no doubt this subject is both interesting and confusing. This book will clear up some of the confusion while retaining interest, for it is readable. Ministers also need this book unless they already know its content better than it is stated here. For how else can they resist the pressures of the advertising of the superiority of this or that translation and how shall they guide their people amidst the perplexities of so many Bibles?

JAMES P. MARTIN

Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study, by Frederick W. Danker. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1960. Pp. 289. $3.75.

The author of this useful work is a member of the New Testament department at Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, and successor to the late William Arndt as co-editor with F. W. Gingrich in the revision of *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. The present work is basically a bibliographical guide which discusses aids to historical-grammatical exegesis of the Bible. Space forbids an enumeration of all the works mentioned but the list is certainly complete enough to satisfy all pastors and almost every student. The critical evaluations of these works are fair and helpful, albeit frequently accompanied by an exhortation to use this work if you do not want your exegesis to remain sick. Indeed it may be possible to become discouraged to see so many aids and tools for Bible study, but fortunately the text of the Bible itself actually occupies the center of the author's concern. And he is undoubtedly right in assuming that many students have a very imperfect acquaintance with even the basic tools such as the Hebrew and Greek critical texts, concordances and lexicons. Persons at various levels of competence in exegetical techniques can profit from this book and no doubt grow with it.

An historical introduction to important works in each bibliographical area is followed by a discussion of the use of the tools. That is provided for the Hebrew text of the O.T., the Septuagint, the Greek N.T., with advice on the use of helps in Nestle's text, concordances, grammars, lexicons, English versions and commentaries. Other chapters discuss Judaica, archeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls. A vast amount of detailed information is given, much of it in the form of examples and illustrations. The treatment is centered on a minute grammatical-historical type of exegesis.

Despite the exhortations, not many pastors will agree off-hand with the quoted opinion of Ferdinand Hitzig who counselled his students to "sell all you have, and buy a Septuagint." There are limits to what can actually be utilized in a busy pastorate. At

the same time it will not hurt anyone to have their sights raised and their present efforts at interpreting the Word of God challenged for the better.

The advanced student who wants bibliographical help in the history of exegesis will do well to follow the author's advice and look up the bibliographies in the third edition of *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.* One final warning: Do not be misled into thinking with some of the older orthodox theologians that a knowledge of the meanings of Hebrew and Greek words *is* the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

JAMES P. MARTIN

Prophet, Speak Now! by Robert B. McNeill. John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1961. Pp. 192. $2.50.

The author delineates the task of the modern prophet in terms of his Old Testament counterpart. Social morality is postulated as the basic element of religion, as compared with its "cultus." The task of the prophet is seen, therefore, to be the recalling of men to ethical living.

The various aspects of this concept of social prophetism are developed in six brief chapters. The first one deals with the nature of the prophet himself and he is depicted as the troubler of the social order which has produced the injustices against which he declaims. The two following chapters show the prophet in conflict with his cult, which has distorted the purity of worship, and against his culture, which has been degraded by the appropriation of social evil. The reaction to the prophetic voice, in contest and in reconciliation, is presented in the next two chapters. The prophet is seen in conflict with a secularized, institutionalized Church, which offers nationalism, sectarianism, segregation and individualism against the social demands of his message. Reconciliation is achieved, however, by the complete involvement of the prophet in the sinful context against which he protests, through the bringing together of his own priestly and prophetic dispositions within the Church itself. In conclusion, the role of the prophetic office is declared to be suppressed by twelve specific aspects of secularism within the Church, which constitute the present Church "crisis," and, by implication, become the challenge of the modern prophet. As in his prologue, the author again sounds the call to social morality in his epilogue.

Whether one agrees or not with the author's thesis, critical points are raised which must be considered by the Church today. At the same time one must pose definite questions as to the validity of the methodology in terms of the premises and conclusions supposedly based upon Biblical parallels. A number of derivations, evaluations, identifications, and even descriptions, used in support of basic presuppositions are misapplied, and often the initial assumptions of arguments are themselves used as the basis of their own proof.

PHILIP C. HAMMOND

God and History In The Old Testament, by Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr. The Seabury Press, Greenwich, Conn., 1960. Pp. vii + 179. $4.25.

Dr. Guthrie states that his book is "an attempt to assess what the Old Testament is about." In his introduction, he therefore establishes the definitions by which he intends to probe the material. The Old Testament is construed to be a "witness" to the disclosure of truth, in terms of the "how," the "where," and the "as whom" of revelation. God is thus seen making himself known in the events of history, in a specific relationship with Israel, as the Lord of life. That, says Guthrie, is what the Old Testament *is* all about!

In simplified form, the witness of the narrative background of the Biblical text is considered, with particular emphasis upon the contributions of the "J" writer. The witness of the Law is traced through its stages of development from a basic covenant to the central core of a "religion of the Book." The role of the Monarchy, the interpretations of the prophets, the reactions of the "E" writer, and the Deuteronomistic reworking of the material are all briefly scanned. The witness of the prophets is considered in some detail, with marked attention paid to the background and transmission of both attitudes and messages. The discussion of the priestly posi-

tion traces the development of that witness from its earliest stages until a final synthesis of viewpoints is achieved in the post-exilic period. Brief note is also made of later attempts to witness to the revelation in the Wisdom and Apocalyptic literature. All of these aspects are finally brought into relation with the "main line" of the Biblical witness, as seen by the author. This, he affirms, is basically the "J" writer, made meaningful by the prophetic movement and forming the nucleus for the crystallization of the rest of the Old Testament. Nor does the "witness" simply cease there, for as both God and history continue, so also the "main line" of the revelation continues, and the New Testament becomes its later expression.

The emphasis placed upon the various facets of the "witness," the stress upon the historical backgrounds of specific parts of it, and the developmental approach, in general, are all of particular interest and value for the reader of this book. Of especial note are the sections dealing with the prophetic movement, the post-exilic reformulations, and the "main line" concept itself. As a result, the author manages to focus attention upon the total coherence of the Biblical materials amid their individual diversity and thus to make clear the continuum of the historical acts of God which unite the Old Testament witness with the New. The author's notes and a (largely modern) bibliography complete, and further enhance, this interesting volume.

PHILIP C. HAMMOND

The Coming Reformation, by Geddes MacGregor. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1960. Pp. 160. $3.50.

The main thesis of this book is that the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century did not fully succeed in accomplishing its laudable and entirely necessary task of reforming the Christian Church, and that this failure has had lamentable consequences for Protestantism ever since. According to the author, Protestantism's basic failure is twofold: First, it has failed to realize the essential reality of the Church as the Body of Christ; and secondly, it has failed to uphold an essential ideal, namely, the ideal of Christian perfection. In order to bring about necessary renewal within Protestantism, there must be at least a revival of discipline, a revival of the spiritual life—i.e., the life of personal devotion—and a revival of liturgy, with the Lord's Supper as the central norm of worship, in practice no less than in theory.

With much of what Dr. MacGregor says many responsible and informed Protestants would agree. Unfortunately his presentation is marred by willful exaggeration and by unnecessary and unwarranted disparagement of the Protestant tradition, to which presumably he belongs. For example, on p. 27 he quotes the hoary story of the beadle (janitor) of Glasgow Cathedral who greeted a woman he found in one of the pews quietly reading her Bible, with the words, "I'll have you know, Madam, that this is not a reading room." If such an incident ever took place, it certainly is not typical of the present-day Church of Scotland, least of all of Glasgow Cathedral. Again, Dr. MacGregor exaggerates the liturgical eccentricities of present-day Protestantism. For instance, on p. 51 he describes a Protestant Church which has "installed in its pulpit a supply of buttons by the manipulation of which the preacher can dramatically vary the color of the church lighting to accord with the mood of his 'message'." It would be foolish and perverse, surely, to contend that such mechanically ingenious, but liturgically objectionable, contraptions are in any way typical of Protestantism in this day, or any other. Besides such exaggerations, Dr. MacGregor, though by no means blind to the faults of the Roman Catholic Church, seems unduly anxious to compare Protestantism unfavorably with it. For instance, on p. 15 he stigmatizes what he calls Protestantism's "self-conscious abstemiousness toward her" (the Virgin Mary). But the Protestant attitude toward the mother of Jesus Christ is modelled on the New Testament, on which it would not seek to improve, Roman Catholic *hyperdulia* notwithstanding.

It is to be hoped that such perversities will not prevent this book from being taken seriously as a critique of contemporary Protestantism, to whose condition it speaks with some point and validity.

NORMAN V. HOPE

An Era in Anglican Theology from Gore to Temple, by Arthur Michael Ramsey. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1960. Pp. 192. $3.50.

In this book Dr. Michael Ramsey, Archbishop-designate of Canterbury, seeks to expound and appraise the development of Anglican theology during the half-century which elapsed between the famous symposium, *Lux Mundi*, in 1889, and the outbreak of World War II in 1939.

During that half-century Anglican theology possessed a self-contained and well defined character. Not many continental theologians—with the exception of Harnack and Schweitzer—influenced it. Scottish theology did not affect it much either—except perhaps for James Denney and Hugh R. Mackintosh. Even Free Church theologians in England—except possibly for P. T. Forsyth, John W. Oman, and C. H. Dodd—did not influence it to any marked degree. Anglican theology had as its major task the problem of relating the Christian faith to the new scientific knowledge, particularly in the fields of biology and Biblical criticism; and it sought to solve this problem pretty much on its own.

As might have been expected, Anglican theology during this period took several forms. There was, of course, the Anglo-Catholic school represented supremely well by Bishop Charles Gore (1853-1932), which boldly accepted the findings of all tested scientific scholarship while holding fast to Catholic orthodoxy as laid down in the Scripture, the Creeds, and the Fathers of the undivided Church. On the other hand there were modernists who not only accepted the findings of science, but seemed willing so to accommodate their understanding of Christianity to such findings as to reject certain New Testament miracles, and even cast doubt on the uniqueness of Jesus Christ as divine Saviour and Lord. Dr. Ramsey mentions as representatives of this viewpoint Hastings Rashdall and F. J. Foakes-Jackson, but he might also have specified Dr. Ernest W. Barnes, the Bishop of Birmingham.

Within the framework of this general program much able thinking went on among Anglican theologians during this period. The traditional Anglican emphasis on the centrality of the Incarnation was of course maintained. As an exposition of the relation of the human to the divine in the person of Jesus Christ the kenotic doctrine enjoyed an unprecedented popularity, though eventually it fell from favor. Careful thought was also given to the interpretation of Jesus Christ's atonement and to the doctrine of the Church. And of course Anglican theology was influenced by the revival of Biblical studies—what Dr. Ramsey calls "the recovery of the Bible"—which was so marked a feature of Protestant theological scholarship in the 1930's.

The chief, and perhaps the most representative, thinker in the Anglican Church during the half-century under consideration was William Temple (1881-1944), who was perhaps the greatest thinker to have sat on the throne of Canterbury since Anselm. But Temple was only one of an able galaxy, which included men as variously able as Gore, Leonard Thornton, Hensley Henson, Kenneth Kirk, H. Rashdall, H. D. A. Major, W. R. Inge and N. P. Williams; and all of these men are duly appraised in Dr. Ramsey's survey.

Perhaps one or two of Dr. Ramsey's judgments are open to question: for example, that T. R. Glover's *The Jesus of History* was written "on the assumptions that the apostolic theology was largely a distortion of His own original Gospel, and that the supernaturalism in the records is largely unhistorical" (p. 62). But he has certainly produced a competent and readable evaluation of Anglican theology during a most formative period in its development.

NORMAN V. HOPE

The Spirit of Protestantism, by Robert McAfee Brown. Oxford University Press, New York, 1961. Pp. 264. $4.50.

In this book Dr. Robert McAfee Brown, of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, seeks to do for Protestantism what Karl Adam has so admirably done for Romanism in his classic, *The Spirit of Catholicism*, namely, to describe it from the inside, from the point of view of a convinced believer in

it. Dr. Brown's task is, of course, more difficult than was Karl Adam's, for the official Roman Catholic position, at least in matters of importance, has been authoritatively laid down by popes and councils throughout the century, so that its spirit is readily identifiable. But Protestantism, on the other hand, is notoriously divided, not only in outward organization but even in certain matters of belief; no one can speak for it with final and universally recognized authority. The author, while recognizing this, nonetheless contends that Protestantism is not a mere negative reaction to Roman Catholicism, but a positive, valid and authentic interpretation of the Christian Gospel in its own right. As such it has, in spite of appearances, an inner integrity of its own, and a relevance to all of life's activities. It is an interpretation of the Gospel, however, which though partially expressed in doctrinal affirmations such as the standard Protestant Confessions, regards these not as final formulae, but rather as imperfect expressions of an attitude and spirit which can be summed up as "allegiance to Jesus Christ as Lord" (p. 41), "an openness to the judging and renewing activity of the loving God made known in Jesus Christ" (p. 40).

After clarifying this understanding of Protestantism Dr. Brown goes on to expound its distinctive doctrines. He deals with such basic matters as the centrality of Grace, the authority of Scripture, the sovereignty of God which finds expression in election, the priesthood of all Christian believers, and the doctrine of Christian vocation. But he also emphasizes as Protestant distinctives the obligation to love God with the mind—i.e., the theological enterprise, and the duty and privilege of worshipping him in the sanctuary, and of observing the two dominical sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

In the next section Dr. Brown deals with what he calls "On-going Protestant Concerns." First he analyzes the relation between Protestantism and Romanism, not pulling any punches, but pointing out the need of each for the other. Then he considers the problem of authority, which he calls "the Achilles' heel of Protestantism." He contends that neither the Bible nor the Church nor personal experience by itself can be considered as finally authoritative, but adds that all three converge in their testimony, though of the three the Bible must be given highest priority. Then he considers the relation of Protestantism to culture, and the concern of Protestantism for what he calls "holy worldliness"—i.e., the belief that God should be glorified not only in the Highest, but also in the High Street. The last chapter in this section deals with the present tensions that exist within Protestantism—for example, between ardor and order, Scripture and tradition, the local and the ecumenical.

In the final chapter—which he entitles "Preface"—Dr. Brown characterizes Protestants as a "pilgrim people" who are journeying towards the Eternal City, not alone, but in the company of fellow believers, and above all sustained by the living presence of Jesus Christ, the builder of that City.

There are those who would exercise the Protestant right of private judgment by taking exception to one or two of Dr. Brown's statements. Thus, on p. 90 he deals with the mystery of the Cross of Jesus Christ, and interprets it to mean that "the judge does not simply condemn us, the judge takes our place as the one accused and is punished in our stead. The punishment we should suffer he suffers on our behalf. And that is the love." By no means all Protestants would subscribe to this manner of interpreting Jesus Christ's sacrifice on Calvary. That he *suffered* in the sinner's stead is agreed; but to call this suffering "punishment" is, to say the least, highly questionable. A similar objection might be raised to the author's interpretation of Jesus' cry of dereliction, which according to Dr. Brown means that "so total was his identification with us, that he even took the burden of utter rejection upon himself" (p. 90). For some Protestants at least it is difficult, and even impossible, to believe that when Jesus was doing God's divinest work of dying for mankind, he was rejected by his Father.

Such criticisms, however, do not mar the book's right to be called an interesting, brightly written, and well-informed interpretation of Protestantism. In his Foreword Dr. Brown explains that he has written with five kinds of readers in mind—perplexed Protestants, wistful pagans, concerned Roman Catholics, inquiring college students, and beleaguered Protestant ministers. It is only fair to say that all five groups would greatly

profit from reading, marking and inwardly digesting its contents.

NORMAN V. HOPE

The Making of a Minister: The Autobiography of Clarence E. Macartney, ed. by J. Clyde Henry. Channel Press, Inc., Great Neck, N.Y., 1961. Pp. 224. $3.00.

Sometime before his lamented death in 1957, Dr. Clarence E. Macartney completed his autobiography, which he entitled, "The Making of a Minister." His twelve-year associate in Pittsburgh, Dr. J. Clyde Henry, has now edited Dr. Macartney's manuscript for publication, and added a perceptive appreciation of its author.

As might have been expected by those who have read any of Dr. Macartney's previous books, this is a deeply interesting volume. It presents a readable and even fascinating account of Dr. Macartney's many-sided interests in life—for example, his tireless travelling in Europe and North America, his vigorous stand on public issues, both ecclesiastical and political, which exercised his Christian conscience, and his deep and abiding interest in the Civil War, on certain aspects of which he became a recognized authority.

But the most intriguing feature of the book is the light which it throws on Dr. Macartney's ministry. For he was a Christian minister first and foremost: he preferred the active pastorate even to a seminary professorship, which he was offered in 1925. For almost fifty years, first in Paterson, New Jersey, from 1905 to 1914, then in Arch Street, Philadelphia, from 1914 to 1927, and finally in the First Church of Pittsburgh between 1927 and 1953, he exercised one of the most fruitful and influential ministries in American Protestantism. This autobiography reveals some of the outward sources of Dr. Macartney's influence as a minister. For one thing, he was prepared both by a devout, indeed levitical, upbringing, which led him to a personal Christian commitment at the age of eleven, and by a sound academic education at Pomona College, the University of Wisconsin, and Princeton Seminary, which made him a student all his life. Secondly, he prepared for the pulpit with meticulous care; and his sermons, solidly grounded in Biblical truth, were delivered without manuscript. Third, he was a devoted pastor throughout his ministry, even in his large Pittsburgh church; for, as he put it, "preaching without calling and coming in contact with people is an academic work" (p. 208). Fourth, he used his intelligence in advertising his pulpit message in worthy ways. For example, when he was minister in Philadelphia, his Arch Street Church was one of the first to broadcast its services. And in Pittsburgh, as he says himself, he "began to emphasize more and more the printed word. Every month several sermons were printed in pamphlet form, distributed to the Sunday congregations, and sent out with the church magazine, 'First Church Life,' to persons all over the world. In this way the message spoken in the pulpit has been broadcast and has had a far wider hearing and influence" (p. 215).

It is interesting to reflect that all three of Dr. Macartney's churches were what today would be called "inner city parishes." But the principles by which he ordered his ministry are surely applicable to parishes of all kinds, whatever their territorial location.

NORMAN V. HOPE

The New-Time Religion, by Claire Cox. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961. Pp. 248. $3.95.

In this brightly written book Miss Claire Cox, a journalist, describes what has been happening in the church life of the United States within the past generation, and particularly since World War II.

She notes the resurgence of interest in religion. Church attendances have increased, church budgets have gone up, new church buildings have been erected, and activities are carried on in them practically every day of the week. Evangelism still ranks as a major activity of ministers and church leaders. But its normal pattern is not that of Billy Graham's mass meetings, but rather that of regular "soft sell" persuasion by private individual contacts: the author calls the exponents of this activity "the quiet evangelists." Ministers and church assemblies are speaking out on public social issues such as politics, birth

control, segregation, alcoholism, and the like. A native architecture is being developed to fill the needs created by the church building boom and the new role of the church as a community center. Old-fashioned "gospel" hymns like "The Old Rugged Cross" still retain their nostalgic popularity, but present day hymnals include fewer of them; and more hymns are being written today on such relatively neglected themes as Christian family life, Christian stewardship, and the world-wide Christian community. The new powerful media of mass communication—particularly the movies and TV—are being increasingly used by the churches to get their message across to the American people. "Since World War II, the American Sunday School has acquired a new look, a new name and a fresh approach to the most ancient textbooks—the Bible" (p. 217). In 1952 the Revised Standard Version of the Bible was issued, and has achieved wide circulation. And the churches are getting together as never before, in federations and organic mergers.

All this adds up to statistical success and bustling activities in the churches of the U.S.A. But this does not mean that all is well with them or their members. Their statistics—e.g. of membership—are notoriously inexact: they represent optimistic guesstimates rather than exact tallies. There is much seepage in the form of loss of church members, particularly among the teenagers and the twenties. There is a good deal of shopping around, for reasons of convenience—the author describes as "the fastest growing, most alive church in America" the C.N.B., the church in the next block—or because of status seeking. The disease of "spectatoritis"—the sideline stance that lets "George," i.e., the minister, do it—is rife. And the population is growing faster than the churches can win and assimilate. Meantime ministers are overworked and underpaid and—perhaps therefore—in short supply; and their wives in all too many cases are lonely and frustrated. The Bible still continues to sell, but it is a reverently unread book: Biblical illiteracy is chronic, even among Sunday School teachers.

The author thus summarizes the church situation in the United States today. But she also ventures an occasional constructive suggestion. For example, she suggests that "the church school teacher should be treated as a special person in the congregation. He is, after all, helping the minister do his job. As an aide to the minister, the teacher should not be asked to do any other work for the Church. He should not be expected to wash dishes after the fellowship dinner or perform other chores" (pp. 231-232).

This book offers an interesting factual survey, rather than an interpretation, of what is happening in the life of the American churches today. As such it should prove interesting and helpful.

NORMAN V. HOPE

Christianity in a Revolutionary Age, by Kenneth S. Latourette. (Vol. III: *The Nineteenth Century Outside Europe: The Americas, the Pacific, Asia and Africa*). Harper & Brothers, New York, 1961. Pp. x + 527. $7.50.

With this book Professor Latourette's projected five volume work on the history of Christianity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries passes the halfway point. Rounding out the "great century" to 1914, these pages survey the Church's penetration of every continent outside its European habitat, a homeland described with olympian detachment as a mere peninsular extension of the Eurasian land mass. In an age when industrial, intellectual, population and political revolutions were challenging the faith with secularism in Europe itself, Protestants and Romanists responded with such zeal that the geographic spread of Christian institutions, at least, became more extensive than any religion had thus far known. In particular, Protestantism ceased to be simply a northwestern European phenomenon.

Latourette divides this work, giving Christianity in the United States as much attention (Chapters II-IX) as in the British possessions, Africa, Asia and Latin America combined (Chapters X-XXIV). Those versed in his earlier writings, and by now several student generations have been raised on them, will recognize more than the clarity and order of style and the dispassionate optimism which are his hallmarks. The very substance of this volume is familiar since

most chapters are admittedly rewrites, condensed from *The History of the Expansion of Christianity* (Volumes IV, V, VI) or expanded from *The History of Christianity* (Chapters 49-55). But for those untraveled in his earlier tomes, this one, the latter half of which sees Latourette dashing "rapidly from land to land" doing whole countries in a few pages each, may serve as an introductory Cook's tour with breathless advantages and frustrations.

Several impressions emerge from the shifting kaleidoscope. As Europeans exploded into the rest of the world satisfying their economic, political and territorial ambitions, their several brands of Christianity went along, sometimes independently, but often under the protection of non-religious auspices. Thus, outside the traditional Christian world, the revolution (Europe's population bomb) occasioned the faith's institutional expansion. Each area reflected its source of import. In the British empire, Anglo-American denominations competed all over again, with the colonial office largely indifferent to their individual or collective success. Latin American Catholicism, like its Mediterranean counterpart, struggled against anticlericalism and separation of Church and State. In Africa and Asia the Christian franchise changed with the colonial power, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant.

The treatment of Christianity in the United States forms the serious part of the volume. Countering the de-Christianizing influences of the frontier on the older stock, absorbing and churching vast immigrant populations, and converting peoples of non-Christian ancestry (Indians and Negroes), were the several facets of the problem of Christianizing the land. Home mission societies using camp meetings and lay leaders spread pietistic evangelicalism on the frontier, while in the cities evangelists of many kinds (Dwight, Finney, Moody and Sunday) combined with lay organizations (Sunday School and YMCA) to swell the ranks. As immigrants poured in tensions arose within denominational families between the Americanisms of the older stock and the Confessional way (Lutheran, Reformed and Roman Catholic) which clung to European patterns, between national groups of Roman Catholics, and between Protestant and Roman ideas of education in a democratic society. In spite of intramural bickering, which does not seem to interest our irenic author, efforts to Christianize the land were statistically successful, 43.4 per cent of the population claiming Church membership by 1910.

The new country with its separation of Church and State, frontier, cultural and linguistic pluralism, and the contradictory demands of sectionalism and nationalism created a revolutionary context within which to solve problems of Church polity. In the anarchy, ardor outwitted order making Methodist and Baptist the largest Protestant groups, enclaves of immigrants fortified their identity behind rigid polities, successive rashes of orthodox theological seminaries proved that denominations were allergic to free thought, and, as if to mock the seriousness of all this denominational exclusiveness, the "evangelical ethos" produced a variety of co-operative agencies (from Christian Endeavour to the Federal Council of Churches) which seemed to elicit higher enthusiasms than the denominations. Romanism, thriving on a minority complex, fought contagious lay democracy (trusteeism), and subdued vestigial European rivalries in the hierarchy. At the same time Christianity's "abounding vitality" produced new organizations to meet new needs: denominations, sects, societies and orders.

The problem of education has come to deserve a chapter of its own, being no longer subsumed under the "effects of Christianity." The story—told all too briefly, for this was perhaps the most challenging aspect of the revolution—is of the shift from a churchly and religious to a state and secular foundation for higher education.

New material appears in chapter seven, America's Christian response to revolutionary intellectual tides. A helpful denominational catalogue of major figures and movements accents Congregationalists including Unitarians, Presbyterians, German Reformed, Baptists, and Methodists. Lutherans, Episcopalians, and Roman Catholics get shortchanged, A. V. G. Allen and W. P. Du Bose, for example, having to share three sentences between them. Early in the century Unitarianism and revival theology challenged Older Calvinism. Later the high Church movement, biblical criticism, evolution, the social gospel

and fundamentalism divided some Churchmen from each other and the scientific world.

Such a survey inevitably invites minor caveats. Has it been proved that Hodge's Calvinism was "unadulterated"? Why do Southern Baptists get notice but not Southern Methodists and Southern Presbyterians? And is it not time American scholars decided whether the followers of Jonathan Edwards are Edward*eans* (Webster), Edward*sians* (Latourette) or Edward*seans*?

One's disappointment in this useful survey is that it breaks so little new ground. Repetition is expected, but not so much mere repetition. The elder statesman of American Church History has played the pioneer in other works, and is not expected to dig around in new piles of primary material. But if he writes about a revolutionary age, even from secondary sources, why does not a sense of drama, conflict and climax inform the structure and tempo of such a history? Instead we read calm catalogues of data organized and informed, not by the dynamics of revolution and chronology, but by the demands of "proper proportions," and the statics of geography and denominations—not even competing denominations, for Romanism and Protestantism, like Isaiah's leopard and kid, are made to lie down together. The result is that questions of Christianity's relation to some revolutionary developments are answered in disconnected fragments, raised only to be dropped, or not raised at all. For example, by denominationalizing chapter seven, no clear picture emerges of the American debate on Darwinism or any other intellectual issue. Thus concentration on the skeletal structure prevents real treatment of internal diseases and institutional metabolism. While there are enticing hints that the relation between missions and imperial motivation is a fascinating story, the whetted appetite is not satisfied. And how is it possible in this centennial year to publish a book about nineteenth century American Christianity without even raising the question of its relation to the Civil War?

There is reason to hope that the final volumes of this massive work will break new ground, since Professor Latourette has not devoted as much attention to the twentieth century in the past. I look forward therefore to the next product of the happy-everaftering which he and Harper's have been enjoying for a quarter of a century. Meanwhile this volume reminds one that research note cards are like tea bags. They can be used more than once, but the second cup is seldom as satisfying as the first.

JOHN E. SMYLIE

Religious Affections, by Jonathan Edwards, ed. John E. Smith. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1959. Pp. 526. $7.50.

The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards, by Douglas J. Elwood, Columbia University Press, New York, 1960. Pp. 220. $3.75.

In 1927, Vernon Louis Parrington, tracing main currents of American thought, called Jonathan Edwards an "anachronism," a democratic mystic still chained to his Calvinism. Since the anniversary of the death of the divine in 1958 and because of the superiority of his mind, recent interpreters have saluted Edwards as one of the most modern men of the eighteenth century and have tried to rescue him from the less salutary aspects of his theological orientation.

It is appropriate that the New Englander's *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* should appear early in the new Yale edition of Edwards' works. This treatise has been rightly described by Perry Miller as the "most profound exploration of the religious psychology in all American literature." Edwards started this work as a series of sermons in 1742. He saw, according to Smith, the "incongruity and even contradiction in the attempt to communicate the truth about life in a lifeless way." Therefore in Edwards "doctrine and style flow together" when, for example, he gave to his Northampton congregation the brilliant analysis of "evangelical humiliation." The treatise in which this exposition is included was first published in 1746 to indicate that the Great Awakening was actually a way better than the rationalism of the proper Bostonian, Charles Chauncy, and the irrational John Davenport (later declared *non compos mentis*), who was wrecking the revival because of his antics.

Smith, who teaches philosophy at Yale University, has prepared an extensive introduction which deals with the historical background of the treatise, the purpose and meaning of the "Twelve Signs of Gracious Affections," the author's intellectual heritage, and the various texts of this composition. He has included in this edition the correspondence between Edwards and Thomas Gillespie, of Scotland, in which Edwards was able to amplify and clarify points of his case. Smith maintains that Edwards contributes to an understanding of the contemporary situation in describing how and when the transcendent God is "graciously" present. First of all, Edwards insists upon man's wholeness. Man is not a set of gears. In dealing with the religious affections, Edwards discusses the essential unity of man's being and describes the most fundamental religious experience as the inclination of the heart toward God. Secondly, he claims that the religious sense always involves "first-person" experience, an experience in which man must taste for himself the power of divine love in order to apprehend its meaning. However, he does not set the evangelical understanding over against learning and the employment of the intellect in religious exercises. Thirdly, Edwards shows how piety, though ultimately rooted in the individual's inscrutable relation to God, should be subjected to scrutiny involving Biblical criteria. The Christian may test the genuineness or the spuriousness of experience. The awakening preacher issues a warning to those who have inherited his fervor against making a mere response to urgency in believing a basis of judging the validity of belief or the sincerity of the believer. In view of the compartmentalization of life and of much undiscerning and indiscriminate religiosity, Smith recommends *Religious Affections* to the twentieth century reader.

Elwood, graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary, and at present, Associate Professor of Religion and Philosophy at Missouri Valley College, portrays Edwards as a philosophical-theologian. He locates the correlation of Edwards' theology and philosophy in divine immediacy. Dismissing some of the more embarrassing aspects of Edwards' thought as hang-overs which mark him as a typical Puritan, the author emphasizes the influence on Edwards of England's pioneer scientists, Locke and Newton. Edwards employed insights gleaned from his ecstatic and exact reading of the work of these men to steer a course between the Scylla of pantheism and the Charybdis of theism. Interpreted by Elwood, Edwards becomes a panentheist before modern panentheists. Edwards made the truth of the gospel relevant through his assertion that God "interpenetrates all things without cancelling or impugning the relative individuality of created entities." He avoided the dangers of the brand of panentheism sometimes called "surrelativism," represented in Whitehead and Hartshorne, by asserting that God does not depend upon the world of contingencies for the completion of his being. There may be "unactualized potentialities in the depth of the being of God," but for Edwards there is "nothing left to be desired which creation can add to His being." God is not lost in an identity with his creation as he tends to be in pantheism. God is not lost in an absenteeism from his creation as he tends to be in theism. He is a "self-giving" God, who controls his creation and who gives to man, in the face of moral evil, a "new sense of things" as the highest aspect of his gracious creativity. The author adds to an understanding of Edwards' view of the religious affections by his presentation of God who is, paradoxically, "transcendently immanent." In this treatment, Edwards' philosophical theology becomes for Elwood an instrument for evangelizing cultured seekers and "cultured despisers" of religion.

As Samuel Hopkins remembered his teacher and clerical colleague, Edwards "studied the Bible more than all other books" and took his "religious principles" from this source rather than from any "human system or body of divinity." Hopkins may have been somewhat naïve about the source of Edwards' ideas and his independence of others. It is unfortunate, however, that Edwards' latter-day friends have not taken Hopkins' point seriously. To be sure, Smith recognizes that Edwards believed "his entire theory of affections was rooted in the biblical picture of the true religious life." Being far more interested in the other literary sources of the author's thought, the editor does not pause long enough to analyze Edwards' hermeneutics, the manner in which Edwards

uses the thousand quotations from the bible which appear in this work. Elwood neglects the same source in the presentation of his argument. He does not discuss adequately the intimations of panentheism in the biblical witness, Edwards' view of the authority of the scripture, and how Edwards employs scripture in the construction of his philosophical-theology. No one can deny that Edwards was an acute critic of the many intellectual currents of his age. But interpreters of Edwards neglect the scripture as an obvious source of his ideas at the risk of misrepresentation.

Edwards is one of America's five or six intellectual giants. Smith and Elwood underscore his importance in their competent interpretations of his thought. There is still no experience like the first-hand study of Edwards himself. This opportunity is made possible by the republication of *Religious Affections.*

JAMES H. SMYLIE

Land of Eldorado, by Sante Uberto Barbieri. Friendship Press, New York, 1961. Pp. 161. $2.95.

Latin America is to be the foreign mission study for the year ahead. As is usual, the Friendship Press has produced a fine set of new books for this study. There are texts for the instruction of all ages, but we shall review only the general adult study book.

The author is a Latin American. Sante Uberto Barbieri was born in Italy, but came to Brazil as a child in the company of his parents. He studied journalism and was converted to the Protestant faith. He is now Methodist bishop of the Buenos Aires area in Argentina, and has for a number of years been a citizen of that country.

In the introduction the author says he will attempt a difficult task: namely, to treat of the history, religion, needs, possibilities—as well as dreams for the future and realities of the present—in a whole continent. The book follows this outline in general.

Beginning with a brief review of history from the discovery of the continent by Columbus, he shows how the various lands were conquered by Spain and Portugal and how the Roman Catholic Church was established. While the countries were still colonies of European nations, the church accomplished a virtual monopoly on religion and education. The type of Roman Catholicism introduced in Latin America from Spain had never known the benefits that came from the Reformation or real foundation upon Scripture.

Though there were a few Protestant attempts to enter Latin America, the first as early as 1555, the actual entrance of Protestantism was through the Bible societies and the general distribution of Scripture in the languages of the people. In the meantime, the Latin American countries had attained their political freedom.

Protestant immigrants began to come in as well as missionaries of the same faith. The number of missionaries from "non-historical" churches has increased during recent years until they now predominate in Latin America. The Pentecostal movement has made very rapid strides in several countries. The author states: "It is impossible at present to know what to do in the face of such a multiplicity of denominations and sects" (page 83). For better or worse, the non-traditional groups constitute a major factor in the Protestant future of Latin America. The great problem is whether they will cooperate with the indigenous churches or form separate groups.

Protestantism faces many obstacles in the continent, from the outright persecution of recent years in Colombia to the large influence of nationalism, materialism or secularism, and even Spiritism has attracted many thousands. Communism is also a major enemy of the gospel, though many Roman Catholic leaders endeavor to associate Communism and Protestantism in the minds of their people.

In spite of all hindrances, however, the Protestant church has come of age in Latin America. There is vital need of cooperation and the ecumenical movement should have a great future in the continent, and through the power of the Holy Spirit overcome the forces of disruption. The writer says, "Preferably, the North American churches should work more through the churches already established and integrated within the Latin American background." In regard to future missionaries he advises: "Mission-

aries cannot come expecting to be the arbiters of things with a dominating attitude. Rather, they must come as servants and co-workers, willing to give themselves unreservedly and under any conditions for Christ's sake."

In spite of many difficulties, Protestant churches are called to a greater and more dynamic role in a fast-growing continent with many nations and many races. If the Christian churches do their duty, the continent to the south may fulfill the dreams of the first explorers and in truth become through the influence of Christ, the "Land of Eldorado."

J. Christy Wilson

Assignment: Overseas, by John Rosengrant, *et al.* Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1960. Pp. 152. $3.50.

This book is an attempt to present a new approach to the problem of the Christians who go overseas in private or government employ. The subtitle gives the purpose of the book, "How to be a welcome resident and a worthy Christian abroad."

The further purposes of the volume are stated as: 1) To help laymen who are planning to live and work overseas—whether in government, business or service agencies—to recognize and fulfill their opportunities for Christian service, and 2) To instruct pastors and church officers in the guidance of men and women about to embark on overseas assignments. It is the outgrowth of the annual Institute on Overseas Churchmanship conducted by the Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The symposium consists of sixteen articles by those who have had experience or are scholars in the various fields of encounter which those who go overseas will meet. The introduction was written by the late Dr. Charles Leber and the whole tone of the volume is a frame of reference on how Christians may exert a positive witness to their faith in the lands where they live and work.

The subject is indeed a vital one now that one million, six hundred thousand Americans are working overseas in various capacities. Some thirty thousand of these are missionaries as such; twenty-five thousand more are representatives of business, which means that a million and a half Americans are abroad in service for government and private agencies.

With the formation of the "Peace Corps" and the growing interest in world affairs the numbers are sure to increase. The questions of how to meet and live with people of other cultures and widely different economic standards take on new meaning and relevance as more and more Americans go to live abroad. The question is will they enter the other lands as more "ugly Americans" or as "the salt of the earth"?

Such subjects as "The Population Explosion" and foreign affairs of our government are considered. Articles are included on relations with other great religions. Then the attention shifts to the uniqueness of the Christian faith and the duty of those who go abroad to represent in a vital way what a Christian and an American should be in relations with those of other backgrounds and cultures.

Wherever Americans go overseas they are likely to find Christian churches which will need their support. Those in government and all the agencies of international assistance, as well as those in the military, may unite with other Christians in worship and service as well as living lives that will reflect their faith and give a loving witness by word and deed to him whom they are called upon to serve in "Assignments Overseas." Thus they may become "un-ugly" Americans who are welcomed in all lands for their character and service.

In this book John Rosengrant has performed a timely and distinctive service for all those who are called upon to counsel those who are leaving for overseas assignments.

J. Christy Wilson

Ethics and the Gospel, by T. W. Manson. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1960. Pp. 109. $2.75.

Students who are acquainted with the scholarly and engagingly written works of the late Professor Manson will welcome this last of his literary efforts. The brilliant pastor, moderator of the Presbyterian Church

of England, and professor of New Testament, has once again put us all in his debt. Although Ethics and the Gospel are rather loosely associated in these lectures, and Christian ethics is not dealt with in any systematic or exhaustive way, yet, ethical motifs of the Bible are illuminated and made relevant to our situation.

After setting forth the primary distinctions of biblical ethics in the first lecture, Manson turns in Chapter II to the ethics of the Mosaic Law and of Judaism. He avoids the usual error of seeing the essence of Hebrew ethics as consisting in legalism and rigorism, and he insists that Jewish ethics also emphasized inward motive. In Chapter III he relates Jesus' ethic of the Sermon on the Mount to the ethics of the Mosaic Law.

It is in Chapter IV that Professor Manson develops what he understands to be the uniqueness of Christian ethics. Up to this point he has dealt largely with biblical as distinguished from philosophical ethics, and he has seen Hebrew and Christian ethics on the same side. Now he proceeds to develop the thesis that both Hebrew and Christian ethics agree in holding to the two foci of loving God and neighbor, but Christian ethics is unique in that to these two points of reference is added a third, which is that we love one another as God has loved us. Christianity adds the concreteness of God's love in action in Jesus Christ. The ideal of Hebrew ethics becomes in Christ not simply an ideal but a living reality. We are to love as God loves, and we can love one another because God first loved us.

Chapter V deals with the nature of the early Christian community as a people called to a holy life and a unique fellowship. Chapter VI focuses primarily upon the way in which the early Church changed the sayings of Jesus which originally were addressed to the world to sayings directed to the problems of a minority group set in the midst of a hostile society.

Not many of the ideas expressed are new, but they are chosen by an expert and developed into a consistent theme. The most important feature of these lectures is that they recover and develop in a fresh way the ethical motif of the imitation of Christ. The imitation is by way of following Christ in *agape* by the power of the Spirit.

GUY H. RANSON

Key Next Door, by Leslie D. Weatherhead. Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1960. Pp. 256. 15s.

Few preachers of his generation have written more books with such popular appeal as Leslie D. Weatherhead, minister emeritus of the City Temple, London. Some thirty-five titles have found their way to the book shelves of countless ministers, and the influence of his devotional spirit, more so than his ideas, upon laymen and clergy alike has been extraordinary. Here, in this new book, he gathers together twenty-five sermons which were preached during the closing years of his pastoral ministry. Written in his own inimitable style these sermons will be cherished as a lasting memento of one of the most distinguished ministries of the English speaking world. Someone has said that "Dr. Weatherhead has always had the gift of transposing the spoken word into the written word without the former losing its power." Those of us, moreover, whose privilege it has been to hear him preach with some regularity, will be able to imagine the sound of his voice and re-live the effect of his flawless delivery.

As a master of English conversational style and of what today we designate as performance, Dr. Weatherhead is undoubtedly in a class by himself. These sermons, however, have some weaknesses that will leave the more thoughtful reader somewhat unsatisfied. Even though the preacher declares strong affirmations intermittently, yet the impact of his preaching on the whole is more soothing than challenging. It is not a matter of "the bland leading the bland," but our human reaction to something we vaguely recall having heard before. What is lacking too is a rugged Christology. In these sermons, Jesus never becomes anything more than a sweet companion of the road who is vital and knows all the answers; he is not the atoning Christ whose Cross smashes our tidy patterns and proclaims the revolution of a new kingdom abroad upon the earth. And then there is the absence of timeliness. In reading these pages

one is confronted with the customary moral problems of the individual and their possible solution, but would never suspect that this preacher lived in a world where such great ideas and movements as existentialism, the new orthodoxy, the liturgical revival, and so forth, were afoot. This is not to suggest, however, that as examples of sermonic effort these sermons are faulty. They are masterpieces of the art of literary expression, with events and incidents exceedingly well described and told, but as Christian proclamation their wholesomeness needs to be augmented by sober strength more commensurate with the challenge of these rugged times.

DONALD MACLEOD

Point of Glad Return, by Lance Webb. Abingdon Press, New York and Nashville, 1960. Pp. 224. $3.50.

This is a rather substantial book of religious essays which in all likelihood were sermons originally. Dr. Webb, the senior minister of North Broadway Methodist Church, Columbus, Ohio, speaks out of a rich background of experience both as preacher and counselor, and his reputation as an interesting and engaging writer was established by his earlier books, *Conquering the Seven Deadly Sins* and *Discovering Love*. Here in these thirteen chapters he explores the matter of who Christ is and how he saves you. He divides his discussion into three main sections: Christ and Your Frustrations; Christ and Your Success; and Christ and Your Human Frailty. In the first two he deals with those phases of our existence for which we are accountable; the third examines those over which we have no control. As he develops the over-all theme he attempts to guide the reader towards a life that is "eternally worth living."

Dr. Webb is himself a good reader. He draws upon the great classics of Christian devotion and the most meaningful works in recent drama and poetry. He knows human nature and therefore much of his message receives a ready response from his readers. With a measure of good sense he tackles difficult issues and questions (e.g., spiritual healing) and indicates for us a plain and sober strategy that is drawn from the presuppositions of our common faith.

In a book so human and so basically a Christian testimony, one hesitates to point critically at small matters. Exegetically, however, the writer is not always sound, e.g., his reading of boredom into the life of the woman at the well in Sychar (p. 37) and guilt into the attitude of the Pharisees (p. 84). Frequently he over-uses what the British call a "parsonic" phrase, such as "Christ and your this or that," which has become such a common generality, or "prideful" instead of "proud," a pious coinage which should be stifled. Otherwise, this is an unusually fine product, a splendid example of what can be done by a minister who safeguards his office as preacher despite the lures of escape presented by the new concept of "pastor-director."

DONALD MACLEOD

The Lord's Supper, by Theodore G. Tappert. Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1961. Pp. 62. $1.00.

This is the seventh in the series of little monographs called Fortress Books that aim "to deal with central themes of Christian faith and life in an uncomplicated way." Dr. Tappert, who is professor of church history at the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, and a recognized authority on the Sacraments, shows rare ability to put religious concepts into words the lay mind can readily understand. In the course of nine brief chapters the writer gives us a most helpful discussion of the Lord's Supper and makes clear some of the troublesome areas where vagueness and contradiction have appeared consistently. Most of the questions laymen ask about this Sacrament are answered helpfully in spite of the limits of space. What is more, some of the minor and traditional customs are traced to their origins and their real significance explained. Members of Session of Presbyterian Churches should benefit from a careful reading of this little book.

DONALD MACLEOD

FACULTY PUBLICATIONS, 1960

James Franklin Armstrong

Book

A Beginner's Workbook to Biblical Hebrew (in conjunction with Virgil M. Rogers), Abingdon Press, New York and Nashville, 1960, pp. 114.

Articles

"Adaptation and Conformity," *Theology Today*, XVII, 1, 6-9.

"Recurring Questions," *ibid.*, XVII, 2, 143-147.

"A Reformed Jubilee," *ibid.*, XVII, 3, 283-287.

"A Critical Note on Genesis VI: 16a," *Vetus Testamentum*, X, 3, 328-333.

Albert E. Bailey

Chapter in Book

"Philosophies of Education and Religious Education," in *Religious Education*, edited by Marvin J. Taylor, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1960.

Georges A. Barrois

Article

"Roman Catholicism: New Look in Doctrine," *Religion in Life*, XXIX, 2, 167-178.

Review

Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, in *Interpretation*, XIV, 3, 354-356.

Charles T. Fritsch

Chapter in Book

"The Concept of God in the Greek Translation of Isaiah," in *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman*, ed., by J. M. Myers, *et al.*, J. J. Augustin, Publisher, Locust Valley, New York, 1960, pp. 155-169.

Article

"Archeological Expedition to Israel, 1960," in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 3, 12-17.

Reviews

Nelson Glueck, *Rivers in the Desert*, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, XVII, 1/2, 61.

Brevard S. Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament*, in *Interpretation*, XV, 1, 86-87.

S. Paul Schilling, *Isaiah Speaks*, in *Presbyterian Outlook*, 143, 3, 15.

Kurt Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community*, *ibid.*, 142, 42, 15.

H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms*, *ibid.*

Paul Goodman, *History of the Jewis*, *ibid.*

Frank M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 1, 66.

Millar Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *ibid.*, 66-67.

Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Old Testament as Word of God.*, *ibid.*, 67.

H. E. Del Medico, *The Riddle of the Scrolls*, in *Pulpit Digest*, XL, 265, 74.

Edmond Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament*, in *Theology Today*, XVII, 1, 112-114.

General

Contributor to *The Douglass Sunday School Lessons.*

Kenneth S. Gapp

Article

"The American Theological Library Association," *Library Trends*, IX, 2, 194-200.

General

Book Review Editor, *Theology Today.*

Philip C. Hammond

Articles

"The Excavation of Petra, 1959," *Yearbook, American Philosophical Society*, 1960, pp. 477 ff.

"The Excavation of Petra, 1959," *Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 159, 1960, pp. 26-31.

"An Ammonite Stamp Seal From 'Amman,'" *ibid.*, No. 160, pp. 38-41.

"Petra," *Biblical Archaeologist*, XXIII, 1, 29ff.

"The Rose-red City," *Arab World*, VI, 4, 6ff.

George S. Hendry

Book

The Westminster Confession for Today, John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia, and S.C.M. Press, London, 1960, pp. 253.

Articles

"The Light of the World," *Theology Today*, XVI, 4, 431-439.

"Theological Table-Talk," *ibid.*, XVII, 1, 90-99; XVII, 2, 213-222.

Review

W. Norman Pittenger, *The Word Incarnate*, in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 13, 2, 184-187.

John H. Hick

Articles

"Theology and Verification," *Theology Today*, XVII, 1, 12-31.

"The Idea of Necessary Being," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 2, 11-21.

"God as Necessary Being," *The Journal of Philosophy*, LVII, 22 & 23, 725-734.

Reviews

J. H. Randall, *The Role of Knowledge in Western Religion*, in *Theology Today*, XVI, 4, 543-545.

Errol E. Harris, *Revelation Through Reason*, *ibid.*, 554-555.

Austin Farrer, *The Freedom of the Will*, *ibid.*, XVII, 2, 268-270.

Walter Leibrecht, ed., *Religion and Culture*, in *The Scottish Journal of Theology*, 13, 1, 83-85.

George Hendry, *The Gospel of the Incarnation*, *ibid.*, 86-89.

Willem Zuurdeeg, *An Analytical Philosophy of Religion*, *ibid.*, 13, 3, 312-315.

Norman Pittenger, *The Word Incarnate*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 1, 76-77.

Geddes MacGregor, *Introduction to Religious Philosophy*, *ibid.*, 77-78.

Giovanni Miegge, *Gospel and Myth in the Thought of Rudolf Bultmann*, in *The Westminster Bookman*, XIX, 4, 7-8.

Jacques Ellul, *The Theological Foundation of Law*, in *The Presbyterian Outlook*, 142, 45, 15.

E. G. Homrighausen

Book Chapter

"The Uniqueness of Our Christian Faith," Assignment: Overseas, John Rosengrant and Others, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, pp. 89-99.

Articles

"Bases Bíblicas Da Edução Cristã," Revista Teológica, Vol. XXII, São Paulo, Brazil (December), 76-82.

"The Church in the World," *Theology Today*, XVI, 4 (January), 520-529; XVII, 1 (April), 100-111; XVII, 2 (July), 223-234; XVII, 3 (October), 375-385.

Review

Philip S. Watson, *The Concept of Grace*, in *The Westminster Bookman*, XIX, 1, 14-15.

Norman Victor Hope

Article

"Diligent, Rugged, and God Fearing," *Presbyterian Life*, 13, 16, 7, 29-30.

Reviews

Owen Chadwick, ed., *Western Asceticism*, in *Monday Morning*, 25, 8, 48.

Williston Walker, *History of the Christian Church*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIII, 3, 82-83.

J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, *ibid.*, 83.

Paul Blanshard, *God and Man in Washington*, *ibid.*, LIV, 1, 70-71.

Kenneth Scott Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Vol. II, *The Nineteenth Century in Europe: The Protestant and Eastern Churches*, *ibid.*, 71-72.

Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, *ibid.*, 72-73.

R. Gordon Milburn, *Significant Church History*, *ibid.*, 72.

Charles Smyth, *Cyril Forster Garbett*, *ibid.*, LIV, 2, 536.

Colin W. Williams, *John Wesley's Theology Today*, *ibid.*, 252.

Hugh T. Kerr

Book

By John Calvin, Association Press, New York, 1960, pp. 124.

Pamphlet

A Year with the Bible, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1960, pp. 24.

Articles

"Protestantism," *The Encyclopedia Americana*, 1960 ed.

"Competition or Conversation," *Theology Today*, XVI, 4, 439-443.

"Theological Table-Talk," *ibid.*, XVI, 4, 512-519; XVII, 3, 366-374.

HOWARD T. KUIST

Book

Jeremiah, and The Lamentations (The Layman's Bible Commentary), John Knox Press, Richmond, Va.; SCM Press, London; and The Ryerson Press, Toronto; 1960, pp. 148.

Article

"The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Thought," *Associate Reformed Presbyterian*, C, 32, 6-7.

Reviews

Gerrit Verkuyl, Editor-in-Chief, *The Holy Bible: The Berkeley Version in Modern English*, in *Interpretation*, XIV, 1, 85-86.

George A. F. Knight, *A Christian Theology of the Old Testament*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIII, 3, 80-81.

WILLIAM R. LANE

Article

"Pešer Style as a Reconstruction Tool in 4 Q Pešer Isaiah *b*," *Revue de Qumran*, II, 2, 283-284.

LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER

Book

American Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents, Volume I, *1607-1820* (with H. Shelton Smith and Robert T. Handy), Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, pp. 615.

DONALD MACLEOD

Book

Word and Sacrament: A Preface to Preaching and Worship, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1960, pp. 176.

Articles

"Religion is Life," *Theology and Life*, III, 3, 163-168.

"Religious and Meaning It" (Sermon), *The United Churchman*, XLV, 16, 2-3.

"Big Enough for Freedom" (Sermon), *Christian Century Pulpit*, XXXI, 7, 20-22.

Reviews

Daniel T. Niles, *The Preacher's Calling to be Servant*, in *The Westminster Bookman*, XIX, 2, 30-31.

Walter Lüthi and Eduard Thurneysen, *Preaching, Confession, The Lord's Supper*, in *The Reformed and Presbyterian World*, XXVI, 2, 93.

Dietrich Ritschl, *A Theology of Proclamation, ibid.*

Robert Davidson, *The Bible Speaks*, in *The Presbyterian Outlook*, CXLII, 15, 15.

James Martin, *The Empty Tomb, ibid.*, 29, 18.

Massey Shepherd, Jr., *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse, ibid.*, 36, 15.

George M. Docherty, *The Greatest Sermons of George H. Morrison, ibid.*, 38, 15.

Erik Routley, *Conversion, ibid.*, 43, 15.

E. Paul Hovey, *A Treasury of Inspirational Anecdotes, Quotations, and Illustrations*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LII, 3, 86.

A. Leonard Griffith, *The Roman Letter Today, ibid.*, 86-87.

Avery Brooke, *Youth Talks with God, ibid.*, 87.

Helmut Thielicke, *The Waiting Father*: Sermons on the Parables of Jesus, *ibid.*, 87-88.

Robert W. Williamson, *Effective Public Prayer, ibid.*, LIV, 1, 81-82.

Union Theological Seminary Faculty, *Essential Books for a Pastor's Library, ibid.*, 82.

A. C. Lovelace and W. C. Rice, *Music and Worship in the Church, ibid.*, 82-83.

Peter Hammond, *Liturgy and Architecture, ibid.*, 83-84.

Robert J. McCracken, *Putting Faith to Work, ibid.*, 2, 56-57.

Helmut Thielicke, *Our Heavenly Father*: Sermons on the Lord's Prayer, *ibid.*, 57-58.

W. B. J. Martin, *Acts of Worship, ibid.*, 58.

General

Editor, *Princeton Seminary Bulletin.*

New Jersey Correspondent to *The Christian Century.*

JAS. I. MCCORD

Chapter in Book

"Foundation for Witness," *The São Paulo Story*, Imprimerie de la Plaine du Rhône, Aigle (Vaud), Switzerland, 1960, pp. 29-35.

Articles

"The Seminary and the Theological Mission," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 1, 52-58 and *Theology Today*, XVII, 3, 290-299.

"Theological Implications of the Relation of Church and Theological School in America," *Bulletin of the American Association of Theological Schools*, June, 24.

"The Theological Dilemma of the Minister," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 2, 3-10.

Review

Karl Barth, *The Humanity of God*, in *Reformed and Presbyterian World*, XXVI, 3, 141-142.

JAMES P. MARTIN

Reviews

Eric G. Jay, *New Testament Greek, An Introductory Grammar*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIII, 3, 81-82.

C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd edn., *ibid.*, LIV, 1, 68-69.

CONRAD HARRY MASSA

Article

"Liturgy Is Life: A Review-Article on Richard Paquier's, *Traite de Liturgique*," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIII, 3, 48-58.

Reviews

Lüthi and Thurneysen, *Preaching, Confession, The Lord's Supper*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 2, 59-60.

Robert H. Mounce, *The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching*, *ibid.*, 60.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Book

Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul (Vol. I of *New Testament Tools and Studies*), E. J. Brill, Leiden and Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1960, pp. xv + 183.

Articles

"The First Family Bible," *Presbyterian Life*, XIII, 8, 18-20.

"How We Got Our Bible," *Eternity*, XI, 6, 9-11, 34-35; XI, 7, 23-27.

"When Did Scribes Begin to Use Writing Desks?" *Akten des XI. internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongresses*, edited by Hans-Georg Beck, Verlag C. H. Beck, Munich, pp. 355-362.

"The Geneva Bible of 1560," *Theology Today*, XVII, 3, 339-352.

Revised the articles on "Maccabees," "Magi," "Millennium," "Mount of Olives," "Nazareth," "New Testament," and other articles, *The World Book Encyclopedia*, Field Enterprises, Inc., Chicago.

"Lectionary," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., Chicago.

Reviews

Walter Thiele, *Wortschatzuntersuchungen zu den lateinischen Texten der Johannesbriefe*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIX, 1, 95-96.

Gustavus S. Paine, *The Learned Man*, in *Eternity*, XI, 4, 38.

Eric Werner, *The Sacred Bridge*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 2, 58-59.

General

Member of Editorial Board and contributor to *Index to Religious Periodical Literature*, vol. 4, ed. by Lucy W. Markley (American Theological Library Association), pp. 504.

The American collaborator in *Bibliographia Patristica, Internationale patristische Bibliographie*, vol. 3, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, pp. 119.

OTTO A. PIPER

Book

The Biblical View of Sex and Marriage, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1960, pp. 239.

Chapter in Book

"The Church and Contemporary Judaism, An Exegetical Study of Romans 9, 10, and 11," *The Church Meets Judaism*, Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn., 1961, pp. 23-60.

Articles

"A New Gospel?" *Christian Century*, LXXVII, 4, 96-99.

"Christians in a Secularized World," *Christianity Today*, IV, 18, 3-6.

"Wholeness of Life," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 2, 22-27.

"Offenbarung IV. Im N.T.," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3rd ed., IV, 1603-1605.

Reviews

Vilmos Vajta, *Luther on Worship: An Interpretation*, in *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte*, LI, 1, 113-114.

William Graham Cole, *Sex and Love in the Bible*, in *Christian Century*, LXXVII, 7, 192.

R. C. P. Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, in *Presbyterian Outlook*, 142, 41, 15.

Charles Caldwell Ryrie, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, in *Eternity*, XI, 8, 47.

R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 2, 48.

The Gospel According to Thomas, translated by Guillamont, Guispel *et al.*, *ibid.*, 48-49.

Edwin C. Blackman, *Biblical Interpretation*, *ibid.*, LIII, 3, 78.

The Gospel According to Thomas, The Coptic text established and translated by A. Guillamont *et al.*, *ibid.*, 78-79.

Luther's Works (Concordia Publishing House and Muhlenberg Press), v. 14, 23, and 40, *ibid.*, 79.

Gustaf Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, *ibid.*, 79-80.

R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, in *Theology Today*, XVI, 4, 547-550.

A. Guillamont, *The Gospel According to Thomas*, and Robert M. Grant, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, *ibid.*, XVII, 3, 405-409.

Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, in *Presbyterian Outlook*, 142, 34, 60.

James H. Smylie

Article

"The Roman Catholic Church, the State, and Al Smith," *Church History*, XXIX, 3, 321-343.

Reviews

Walter J. Ong, S.J., *American Catholic Crossroads*; Gustave Weigel, S.J., *Faith and Understanding in America*; Winthrop Hudson, *Understanding Roman Catholicism*; Walter R. Clyde, *Interpreting Protestantism to Catholics*; in *Religion in Life*, XXIX, 2, 300-301.

Norman Cousins, *"In God We Trust," The Religious Beliefs and Ideas of the American Founding Fathers*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 1, 73-75.

Robert Moats Miller, *American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939*, *ibid.*, 75-76.

Neil G. McCluskey, *Catholic Viewpoint in Education*, *ibid.*, LIV, 2, 52-54.

Robert A. Graham, *Vatican Diplomacy, A Study of Church and State on the International Plane*, *ibid.*, 54-56.

George H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church, the Crisis of the Protestant Reformation*, in *The Catholic Historical Review*, XLVI, 3, 340-341.

Donald M. Stine

Review

Walter A. Maier, *The Book of Naham: A Commentary*, in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LIV, 1, 69-70.

D. Campbell Wyckoff

Chapter in Book

"The Curriculum and the Church School," Chapter 9 in Marvin J. Taylor (ed.), *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey*, Abingdon Press, 1960.

Articles

"The Bible in Church-School Curriculum," *The Church School*, XIV, 1, 3-5.

"The Church Has a Task in Our World," *Vision*, LIII, 26, 2-3, 13.

"Communication and Education," "The Church's Communication as a Task in the Community," and "Form and Message in Christian Communication," *Reflections, Proceedings and the 16th International Conference on Audio-Visuals in the Church*, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., New York, 1960, pp. 9-11, 17-20, 23-24, 30-31.

"Evaluate Your Work," *International Journal of Religious Education*, XXXVII, 3, 19, 22.

"The Teacher's Faith and How He Teaches," syndicated by the Committee on Children's Work, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., and published in eleven denominational church school magazines.

Review

John H. Gerstner, *Steps to Salvation: The Evangelistic Message of Jonathan Edwards*, in *The Westminster Bookman*, XIX, 1, 15-16.

Theology Today

Jas. I. McCord, *Chairman, Editorial Committee*
John A. Mackay, *Honorary Chairman*
Hugh T. Kerr, *Editor*

Volume XVIII Number 2

CONTENTS FOR JULY, 1961

Editorial:

The Hard Reality of Living and Dying with Christ *J. Robert Nelson*

The Stranger ..... *James F. Armstrong*

The Wholeness of Man ..... *Samuel H. Miller*

Justification and Self-Justification in Sartre ..... *E. Leonard Allen*

Patterns of Christian Social Action ..... *James M. Gustafson*

The Pastor's Role as Prophet ..... *John R. Bodo*

A Good Word for William Dowsing ..... *James F. White*

The New English Bible: A Review ..... *Henry J. Cadbury*

Crucifixion and Atonement ..... *Alan Caine*

The Church in the World ..... *E. G. Homrighausen*

Book Reviews

Published quarterly by: Theology Today, P.O. Box 29, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. Subscription rates: United States, Canada, and Mexico, $3.00 per year, $5.00 for 2 years; the British Empire except Canada 15/- per year (British agent: B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., Oxford, England); all other countries, $3.50 per year in U.S. funds, $6.00 for 2 years; student rate, $2.00 per year.

Recent Publications by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary

THEORY AND DESIGN OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION CURRICULUM

D. CAMPBELL WYCKOFF

The Westminster Press, Phila., Pa. **Pp. 224. $4.50**

"A comprehensive restatement of curriculum theory and design has had to await this present book; thus the entire Christian education world must needs express to Professor Wyckoff profound appreciation for his undertaking and accomplishing this task. This book is bound to receive wide circulation among all concerned with curriculum building and writing and executing, in denominational offices, theological schools, and local parishes."

—The Westminster Bookman

THE CHURCH MEETS JUDAISM

OTTO A. PIPER, JAKOB JOCZ, AND HAROLD FLOREEN

Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. **Pp. 98. $1.75**

This book is a fresh approach to a perplexing problem. In the past the churches have refrained from doing missionary work among the Jews, leaving the task to fringe groups and organizations headed by converted Jews. Dr. Jocz gives a vivid picture of the perplexities and contradictions characteristic of American Jewry. Dr. Piper, in an analysis of Romans, Chapters 9-11, points out that the basic obligation of the Church consists in taking Judaism and the Jews seriously for the role they are playing in holy history. Dr. Floreen, finally, describes the work being done among Jews by Lutheran churches.

LOVE IS A SPENDTHRIFT

PAUL E. SCHERER*

Harper & Brothers, New York, N.Y. **Pp. 230. $3.75**

"Paul Scherer has no peer in putting the word of God into words that waken us with their penetration and haunt us with their beauty. Each meditation is a seed which starts growing in the mind of the reader. A rich contribution, unique in concept and noble in content. A book that will be read and reread by ourselves and go on being read by our grandchildren."

—Ralph W. Sockman

* Visiting Professor, 1961-62.